

*R*

**Roman Forgeries**  
IN THE  
**COUNCILS**  
During the First Four  
**CENTURIES.**  
Together with An  
**APPENDIX**  
Concerning the  
**FORGERIES and ERRORS**  
IN THE  
**ANNALS OF BARONIUS.**

By *THOMAS COMBER, D. D.*  
*Prebend of YORK.*

**L O N D O N,**  
Printed by *Samuel Roycroft*, for *Robert Clavell* at the  
*Peacock* at the West-End of *S. Pauls*, 1689.

## The Epistle Dedicatory.

*many of that Order have not the Advantage or the Opportunity to acquire this Knowledge from the Original Authors, and therefore are forced to seek it in the Roman Editions of the Councils, and the Modern Historians of that Church: Where every thing is misrepresented and placed in so False a Light, that its hard to find out what is Truth. Some of the genuine Remains of Antiquity they have concealed, but they have falsified and altered more, and added so much to the Primitive Records, especially in the first Four Centuries, that near Three Parts of Four (both in Baronius and the Councils) are modern Forgeries, manifest Legends, and impertinent Excursions into Sophistical Vindications, and the later Doctrins and Practices*



## The Epistle Dedicatory.

*Practices of Rome.* It would therefore be a Work worthy of this excellent Church in so Learned an Age, to make an accurate Collection of that, and only that which is true and certain in the Primitive History and Councils. 'Tis true, divers Eminent Men have made some steps toward it; but it is too great an Undertaking for any One Man to accomplish, as appears by that generous Project of Dr. Thomas James, Proposed to the Most Learned Primate of Ireland, to employ a Select Company of both Universities, with due Assistances and Encouragement for the perfecting this Design: Wherefore in the mean time, it may be serviceable to gather together some Materials for so Noble a purpose, and that first encouraged me to make these Observations as I  
was

## The Epistle Dedicatory.

*was Reading the Annals of Baro-  
nius with the Councils: Which I  
have (by the Advice of some of my  
Friends) Methodically digested in  
this little Tract; and I hope it may  
be useful, not only to direct such as  
apply themselves to this kind of Study,  
but also to confirm others of Our own  
Communion in their firm Adherence to  
their Excellent Religion, when they  
see so many plain Evidences, That  
all the Roman Churches Pretences  
to Antiquity (both in Doctrin and  
Worship) are founded on, and main-  
tained by little else, but those Forge-  
ries and Corruptions, by which they  
Imposed upon the Ignorant and Easie  
World for Six or Seven Centuries  
together. These Pious Frauds (as  
They counted them) did indeed then  
advance their Interest, and establish  
their*

## The Epistle Dedicatory.

*their Errors; but now when they are detected by this Discerning Generation, they prove their utter Shame; and did not Secular Advantages and Implicit Faith, or Fear and Inquisitions hinder those under their Yoke from being acquainted, or however from owning these unfaithful Actings of their Spiritual Guides; These Discoveries would not only secure Our People, but make many Converts from Them.*

*But (My Lord) whatever the Work or the Success be, I am obliged to lay it at Your Graces Feet, as the first thing I have made Public since Your Graces happy Advancement to the Government of this Church, whereof I am a Member, and wherein by Your Graces Influence I shall study to serve the Primitive-Protestant-Church of England. Which I beseech Al-*  
a mighty

*The Epistle Dedicatory.*

mighty G O D to defend from all  
its Enemies, and long to preserve  
Your Grace, to be a Support and  
an Honour to it. *So Prays,*

MY LORD,

*Your Graces most Dutiful*

*York, Aug. 20.  
1689.*

*Son and Servant,*

THO: COMBER.

---

T H E

---

# THE Introduction.

**W**Hen Campian long ago undertook to defend the Roman Cause, he boasted, that He was strengthened with the firm and powerful Guard of all the Councils, and that all the General Councils were on his side (a). Which vain Brag the Writers from the Roman Church do frequently repeat to this very day. But he that with Judgment and Diligence shall peruse their own allowed Editions of the Councils, will easily discover the falshood of this Assertion: For there is such adding and expunging, such altering and disguising things in the Body of the Councils, and such excusing, falsifying, and shuffling in the Notes, that a Judicious Reader will soon perceive these Venerable Records, truly set down and explained, do not favour them. But these Corruptions are carried on with such Confidence and Cunning, that an unexperienced and unwary Student, may be imposed on by this specious shew of Venerable Antiquity: For their sakes therefore, it's necessary to take a short view of that Fraud and Policy, which is so commonly made use of in those Editions of the Councils which pass through the Roman Mint, especially in those which are in most use among us, viz. The Edition of Severinus Binius (b), and that of

(a) Campian.  
decem rat.  
pag. 24, & 30.

(b) Edit. Bini  
Concil. omn.  
Colou. 1618.



## The Introduction.

(c) Edit. Lab. & Labbé and Cossartius (c), wherein Binius his Notes are  
 Cossart. Paris, printed verbatim. Which useful design was begun by a  
 An. 1671. Learned and Ingenious Gentleman, in a Tract entituled  
*Roman Forgeries*, printed at London, An. 1673: But  
 that Author doth not follow the exact order of Time, nor  
 doth he go much beyond the Nicene Council, and even  
 in that Period he left out many plain Instances; And  
 whereas he died, before he had proceeded any further;  
 I resolved to begin where he left off: But for Methods  
 sake, and to make this Discourse more entire, I have  
 begun with the first Century, and so proceeded accord-  
 ing to the order of the several Councils (only writing  
 more briefly upon the Three first Centuries, which were  
 largely treated of in that Author before) deducing the  
 account of these Impostures down to the end of the  
 Fourth Century, and shewing (as I go along) what Ar-  
 tifices have been used by the Editors and Annotator to  
 dress up these Ancient Evidences, so as to make them  
 look favourably upon their great Diana, the Supremacy  
 and other Corruptions of the Roman Church. To this  
 end they have published many spurious Councils, many  
 counterfeit Canons and forged Decretals; and for such  
 as are genuine, they have frequently altered the Text,  
 both by Additions and Diminutions, and have so dis-  
 guised the Sense by partial and fallacious Notes, that  
 it will be evident (by the Remarks here made upon  
 them) their business in the publishing these Volumes,  
 was not to promote the Truth, but to serve a Party.  
 Nor can any thing else be expected from Binius his  
 Notes, which (as he owns in his Preface) He took out  
 of Baronius, Bellarmin and Possevin: The design of  
 which three Men (saith Richerius an ingenuous Sor-  
 bon Doctor) is evident to all Men to have been no  
 other, but to prove the Pope was appointed by  
 Christ

## The Introduction.

Christ to be the absolute Monarch, and Infallible Judge of his Church (d). And since the Notes chiefly follow Baronius, we have, as we go along, in every Period noted several of the designed Falshoods, and of the Contradictions, Errors and Mistakes in his Annals. Which History is so full of Forgeries, false Quotations, and feigned Tales to set up the Credit of the Roman Church, and its corrupt Opinions and Practices, that to discover them all would require almost as many Volumes as his Annals make: So that we must content our selves with some of the plainest Instances which fall into this Matter of the Councils, and will set them in a clear Light, and shew they are as contrary to Reason, as they are to true History. Which Undertaking we hope will be many ways useful: First, It will tend to the ease of those who intend to read over the Tomes of the Councils, or the Annals of Baronius, and save them much time and pains by presenting the principal Errors of those great Volumes at one View, which they would spend a long time in searching after, if they were to gather them up as they lye dispersed. Secondly, It may be very useful to those who desire to be rightly informed in the Controversies between us and the Roman Church, because it will give them a clear prospect of what Councils and other Antiquities are Authentic, and may be allowed for Evidence in this Dispute; wherein our Adversaries have so little regard to their own Honour, that generally one half of their Evidence is such as they have either forged or corrupted. Thirdly, It will be necessary (by way of Antidote) to prepare those, who by reading Books so full of Infection, may by these plausible Falsifications be in danger

(d) Richer.  
Præf. ad hist.  
Concil. pag. 4.

## The Introduction.

*danger to be seduced into a great esteem of the Opinions and Practices of the Roman Church; when they find so many seemingly ancient Tracts and Councils brought in to justify her in all things, and see (by this false Light) all Ecclesiastical History and Records so modelled, as to perswade their Readers, That in the purest Christian Times, all things were believed and done in the Catholic Church just as they are now at Rome. But when it shall appear, that all this is a continued Series and train of Impostures, it will render their Notions and Practices, not only suspected, but odious, as needing such vile and base Artifices, to make them seem agreeable to true Antiquity.*

*To this it may be Objected, That divers of the Modern Writers of this Church, and especially the most Learned, do now own divers of these Forgeries which we here detect to have been spurious, and therefore it seems needlest to prove that which they have already granted us. I reply, That none of them own all these Corruptions, and divers of their Authors cite them very confidently to this very day, and still the things themselves stand in their most approved Editions of Councils, and the Remarks are only in Marginal Notes. But since they were believed in those Ages, while their Supremacy and other Novel Doctrins were setting up, and were urged for good Proofs, till these Opinions had taken root; it is not satisfaction enough to renounce that Evidence, of which they now have no more need, unless they disclaim the Doctrins also to which they first gave Credit: And till they do this, it is fit the World should know by what False-Evidence they first gained these Points. For, if a Man should get an*  
*Estate*

## The Introduction.

*Estate by Bribing his Jury and his Witnesses, it is not enough for him to confess these Persons were Suborned, unless he restore the Ill-gotten Lands; and till he restore them, he ought to be upbraided with his Bribery, even after he hath acknowledged it. Secondly, It may be alledged, That Junius, River and Daillé abroad; Perkins, Cook and James at home; have taken great pains on this Subject, and that the Learned Author of the Historical Examination of the Authority of General Councils, printed at London, 1688. hath already handled this Argument. I Answer, That the Six former are chiefly concerned in the Tracts of particular Fathers, and make few Remarks on the Councils: The last indeed keeps close to the Great Councils, but passes over the Small ones; and any who compares this Discourse with that, will find the Design, the Method and Instances so different, that this Discourse will still be useful in its kind, as that will be also: For here, in an accurate Order, all the Frauds of that Church are put together throughout every Century, not only what have been observed by others, but many now first taken notice of, and not observed before. And indeed, the Instances of these Frauds are so many, that we have been forced to give but brief Touches upon divers of the Particulars, and could neither enlarge upon single Instances, nor adorn the Style; our business being chiefly to direct the younger Students in Ecclesiastical Antiquity; and if our Remarks be but so clear as to be understood by, and useful to them, we have our Aim. And it is hoped this may suffice to prove, That the genuine Records of Councils do condemn the Modern Doctrine, Worship and Discipline of the Roman Church, and*

*Dr. Jerkint. M. A.*

## The Introduction.

*and that whatever in these Editions of them seems to countenance those things, are Forgeries and Corruptions devised on purpose to set a false gloss upon their Modern Inventions. The Methodical Discovery whereof may convince any unprejudiced Man, That Ours is the truly Ancient and Catholic Religion, and Theirs a Device of later times, which cannot be rendred any way agreeable to the Primitive Writings, without innumerable Impostures and Falsifications.*

---

A

L



---

A  
BRIEF ACCOUNT  
OF THE  
**Roman Forgeries,**  
IN THE  
VOLUMES  
OF THE  
**COUNCILS,**  
For the First Three Centuries.

---



---

PART I.

---

CHAPTER I.

*Of the Forgeries in the First Century.*

§. I. **T**HE Volumes of the COUNCILS in the Edition of *Labbe* and *Cossartius*, begin with divers Tracts; and in *Binuius's* Edition with several Epistles, designed to prepossess the Reader with false Notions of the Popes supreme Power over Councils, and his Parties high Reverence for

B

them

them, as also of the Protestants having corrupted or else rejected the greatest part of them: But this whole Discourse will sufficiently shew the notorious untruth, both of their boasting concerning Their own side, and of their Censures concerning Ours. In the Account of Scripture Councils, where they pretend to recite the words of Scripture, they add, for to give colour to their new Supremacy, *That Peter stood up, as the Principal and Head* (a); And again, *as the Supreme and Head* (b). S. Luke in the *Acts*, Chap. VI. 2. saith, *The Twelve Apostles gave the multitude leave to elect Seven Deacons*. *Binin's Notes* say, *They had this leave by the favour and grant of Peter* (c). S. Luke, Chap. XV. declares, That the Question about Circumcision was finally determined by S. James, who also cited Scripture for his determination, ver. 16, 17. But *Binin's Notes* say, *This matter was determined, not by Scripture, but by the Suffrage of the Apostles, and by the Judgment of Peter* (d). The same Notes a little after tell us, *That this Council committed the care of the Circumcised Converts to Peter* (e); which was a poor Preferment for that Apostle, if Christ had made him Supreme Head, and committed to him long before the Care of the whole Catholic Church. To these Passages of Holy Scripture the Editors have tacked a fabulous Story of the *Assumption of the Virgin Mary* (f); but they do not Cite one genuine Ancient Author, to prove it: That Book which bears the Title of *Dionysius Areopagitus* being invented many Ages after, as Learned men on all sides now agree.

§. 2. That Ancient Collection of Canons, which were decreed by the Apostolical Men in divers Synods held during the Times of Persecution, is published by these Editors under the Title of *The Canons of the Holy Apostles*; and their Notes affirm, *They were made by the Authority of the Apostles* (g); yet they are not agreed either about their Number or Authority. They print LXXXIV Canons; but the Notes say, *only the first*

- (a) *Lab. Tom. III.*  
pag. 18. &  
*Bin. Tom. I.*  
par. 1. pag. 1.  
(b) *Ibid. pag. 20.*  
*Bin. pag. 2.*  
(c) *B. N. pag. 1.*  
col. 2. F.

- (d) *Lab. pag. 20.*  
*Bin. pag. 2. col. 1.*  
(e) *Lab. pag. 21.*  
*Bin. pag. 2.*  
col. 2.

- (f) *Lab. pag. 24.*  
*Bin. pag. 3.*  
col. 2.

- (g) *Lab. pag. 53.*  
*Bin. pag. 14.*  
col. 1.

## Part I. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

3

first Fifty of them are Authentic, but the rest may and ought also to be received, since they contain nothing (Two of them excepted, viz. the 65th and 84th Canons, which contradict the Roman Church) but what is approved by some Popes, Councils and Fathers (h). Now, if (as they say) the Apostles made them, their Church hath been very negligent to lose the certain Account of their number, and it is not very modest to pretend to try the Apostles Decrees by Popes Councils and Fathers; yet it is plain they make no distinction between the first Fifty and the following Thirty four, rejecting all that oppose their present Doctrine and Practice, as may be seen in these Instances.

(h) Lab. }  
8c } ibid.  
Bin. }

The Sixth Canon forbids a Bishop, Priest or Deacon (*ἐπίσκοπος*) to put away, or be divorced from his Wife on pretence of Religion: The Notes pervert the Sense of this Canon, as if it only forbid Clergy Men to cast off the care of providing for their Wives; and prove this Sense (i) by a false Title, which *Dionysius Exiguus* put to this Canon in his Version many Centuries after, and by an Epistle of Pope *Clement* the First, which all Men own now to be spurious, and by an Epistle of Pope *Gregory*, who lived in the Year 600; as if the Sense of *Dionysius* and Pope *Gregory*, when Single life was superstitiously pressed upon the Clergy, were good proof, that Clergy Men did not live with their Wives many Ages before that superstitious Opinion was heard of. 'Tis certain the Greek Clergy are Married and cohabit with their Wives, according to this Apostolical Canon, and the Fifteenth Canon of the Sixth General Council: And it is not unpleasant to observe, That these Notes cite the Second Council of *Nice*, to prove there were no Canons made in the Sixth General Council; yet that very *Nicene* Council often Quotes, and highly approves the 82d Canon of the Sixth General Council, as giving some Countenance to their Image-Worship. So that their wresting this Canon Apostolical from its genuine meaning (k) upon such slight and false Evidence, is in effect rejecting it.

(i) Lab. pag. 53.  
Bin. pag. 14.  
col 2.

(k) Vid. Beuz.  
ridg. Not. Con-  
cil. Tom. II.

(1) *Lab. pag. 55. Bin. pag. 15. col. 1.* The Ninth Canon orders *All the Clergy and Laity who are in the Church, to Receive the Sacrament, unless they have a just Excuse* (1): But the Roman Church allows the People generally to stand by and look on; and therefore though this be one of the Authentic Canons before said by them to be made by the Apostles, after some shuffling to restrain it (contrary to the very words of the Canon) only to the Clergy: The Notes say, *This whole Decree was made only by Human, not by Divine Authority, and is now abrogated by a contrary Custom.* So that if a Canon of the Apostles themselves contradict a Corrupt practice of their Church, it must be abrogated and rejected.

*m) Lab. pag. 56. Bin. pag. 15. col. 2.* The 17th Canon saith, *He that keeps a Concubine shall not be in any Order of the Clergy.* The Notes cite some of their Doctors, who affirm, *That this Crime doth not make a Clerk irregular* (m); and, *that this Canon is now revoked.* The Annotator himself is of Opinion, It is only public keeping a Concubine, by reason of the Infamy which makes a Clergy-mans Orders void: Wherefore such Sinners have now more favourable Casuists at Rome, than the Apostles or Apostolical Men were.

(n) *Lab. pag. 60. Bin. pag. 17. col. 2.* The 65th Canon, though it have as good Evidence for it as any of the rest, is rejected by the Notes (n); because *it forbids Men to fast on Saturday*, which is now a Fasting-day at Rome. The Notes say, *No Father mentions this Canon*; but presently own, *That Ignatius, Clemens Romanus, the Canons of the Sixth General Council, Gregory Nyssen, and Anastasius Nicænus, (to which we add Tertullian (o),) do all speak of Saturday, as a Day on which Fasting was forbid.* The Notes confess also, *That the Eastern-Church, and the Church of Milan in S. Ambrose time, allowed not Fasting upon Saturday (p); yet after all, they will not grant this Canon to be genuine, only because it is very unlikely, that the Church of Rome should contradict a Canon of the Apostles, whereas we have already seen, it takes no scruple to contradict them, if they agree not with their practice.* The Notes indeed say, but without any proof, *That Rome received the*

## Part I. *Roman Forgeries in the Councils.*

5

*the Saturday Fast from Peter and Paul*; yet they grant soon after, *That after the Hereſie of Marcion was extinct, the Roman Church did not only lawfully, but piously Faſt on Saturday.* So that this was a private Cuſtom of the Roman Church, in which it differed from all other Churches, and they know not when it began, nor who it came from; yet for ſuch a Cuſtoms ſake they reject an Apoſtolicall Canon.

The 69<sup>th</sup> Canon expreſſly enjoyns *the Wednesday Faſt*; and the Notes ſay, *That many Fathers mention it as of ancient Inſtitution*; yea, theſe Notes affirm, *It was certainly a Faſt of the Apoſtles inſtituting, being obſerved by the whole Church, and not appointed by any Council, but ſpoken of by Authors of greateſt Antiquity* (q). Well then, I hope the Roman Church (whoſe Cuſtoms are all ſaid to be Apoſtolicall) do keep this *Wednesday Faſt*; They tell you, No: *This Wednesday Faſt in their Church is changed into the Saturday Faſt*: And ſo farewel to this Canon alſo.

Laſtly the 84<sup>th</sup> Canon gives us a Canon of Scripture, which doth not agree with the *Trent Canon*, for it rejects *Eccleſiaſticus* from being Canonical, and mentions not *Wiſdom, Tobit, Judith*, nor (in Old Copies (r)) the Book of *Machabees*, which the Roman Church now ſay are Canonical Scripture: And this is the true reaſon why the Notes reject this Canon (s): They alledge indeed ſome other frivolous reaſons, ſuch as, the leaving out the *Revelations*, and putting in *Clements Conſtitutions*: But it ſeems very probable to me, that it was not the Greeks (as the Notes ſuggeſt) but that Impoſtor (who gave theſe Canons a falſe Title and called them *the Apoſtles Canons*) which for carrying on his Pious Fraud, left out the *Revelations*, being not written at that time, when he would have us believe theſe Canons were made; and He alſo put in the Conſtitutions, which are forged in the name of the Apoſtles, who were to be ſet up as Authors alſo of theſe Canons: And if that were ſo, this 84<sup>th</sup> Canon being cleared from thoſe two Corruptions, is an Ancient and very Authent.

(q) Lab. pag. 5.  
Bin. pag. 18.  
col. 1.

(r) Dr. C. ſenſu  
Hiſtor. Canon.  
Chap. 4.  
(s) Lab. pag. 61  
Bin. pag. 18.  
col. 2.



Authentic Record of the true and genuine Books of Holy Scripture, but the Romanists reject it, as being a good evidence against their New Trent Canon.

§ 3. To these Canons are joyned a pretended Council of the Apostles at *Antioch*, first put into the *Tomes* of the Councils, by *Binius*, and continued by *Labbe* (t); one Canon of which allows *Christians* to make an image of *Christ*: But this notorious, and improbable Forgery was never heard of in any Author, till that infamous second *Nicene* Council, which wanting proofs for Image-worship from genuine Antiquity, impudently feigned such Authorities as this pretended Council.

(t) *Lab. pag. 62.*  
*Bin. pag. 18.*  
col. 2.

§ 4. The Pontifical or Lives of the Popes (which begins here) bears the Title of Pope *Damasus*; but the Notes say *Damasus* was not Author of it, being evidently patched up out of two different Authors, containing contradictions almost in every Popes Life. So that no account is to be made of a Writing so different from it self (u): Now if this be (as it certainly is) a True Character of the Pontifical, Why do these Editors print it? Why do the Notes so often cite it as good History? Why do their Divines quote it as good Authority to prove their Modern Corruptions to have been primitive Rites (w)? Since it is a manifest Legend, and contained at first nothing but the bare Names and continuance of the several Popes; and was filled up by *Isidore Mercator*, who forged the Decretal Epistles, with many improbable Fictions unsuitable both to the Men and Times, for which they were invented, and designed to be a ground for those Decretal Epistles; and to make the World believe, that all the Popes were considerable for their Actions in all Ages, as Dr. *Pearson* hath excellently proved in his Learned *Posthumous* Dissertation (x): Yet not only these Editors of the Councils print this corrupt Legend, but their very Breviaries and Missals generally appoint the Lessons out

(u) *Lab. pag. 63.*  
*Bin. pag. 19.*  
col. 2.

(w) *Harding a.*  
*gainst jewel.*  
*pag. 53.*  
*Dr. James corrup.*  
*of Faith,*  
*par. 1. p. 22.*

(x) *Cestriens.*  
*dissert. posthum.*  
*lib. 2. cap. 1, 2.*  
*&c.*

of it, on the Festivals of these Ancient Popes; publishing in the very Church in time of Divine Service, these Fictions for the true ground of the Peoples Devotions on those Days: I confess *Binius* out of *Baronius* hath Notes upon every Pope's Life, and rejects commonly some part of it; but then it is such passages as no way concern the opinion or practice of the present Roman Church: For the passages which do agree thereto (though equally false) he generally defends, yea cites them to prove their Modern Faith and Usages: But as we come to the several Popes Lives, which these Editors make the grand direction in Ecclesiastical Chronology, we shall observe the many and gross Errors contained in it; We begin with the Life of *S. Peter*, whom if we do allow to have been at *Rome*, as this Author reports, yet we cannot believe he ordained three Bishops for his Successors there in his Life-time, viz. *Linus*, *Cletus* and *Clement*: Nor that he was Buried in three several places, in *Apollo's Temple*, and besides *Nero's Pallace in the Vatican*, and besides the *Triumphal Territory*, which this fabulous Writer affirms: Nor will the Annotator admit that *S. Peter* could be Crucified by *Nero* in the 38th year after Christ's Passion, which was three years almost after *Nero's* own Death.

§ 5. The next place, (ever since *P. Crabs* Edition) is by the Roman Editors allotted to a *Treatise of the Popes Supremacy* (y), writ of late Times by some manifest Sycophant of the Roman Church, yet placed here among the Venerable Antiquities of the Apostolic Age, to clap a false Bias on the unwary Reader; and make him apt to believe (that which *Richerius* said is the main design of *Bellarmin*, *Baronius* and *Possevino* in all their Works, viz.) that the Pope was made by Christ the infallible and absolute Monarch of the Church (z); but the Tract it self makes out this high Claim, chiefly by the Decretal Epistles, which are now confessed to be Forgeries; And by the Sayings of Popes, who were not

(y) *Lab.* col. 64.

*Bin.* pag. 20.

col. 2.

(z) *Richer.*  
praefat. ad histor.  
Concil.

to

(a) John. V. 31.  
nemo sibi & pro-  
fessor, & testis.  
Tert. in Mar-  
cion. lib. 5.

to be believed in their own case (a): To which are added some few Fragments of the Fathers falsely applied, and certain false Arguments, which have been confuted a thousand times. So that the placing this Treatise here, serves only to shew the Editors partiality to promote a bad Cause.

§. 6. The Pontifical places *Linus* as *S. Peters* Successor; but the Notes confess, that the Fathers are not agreed about it (b): They own that *Tertullian*, *Epiphanius* and *Ruffinus* make *Clement* to succeed *Peter*; and the late Learned Bishop of *Chester* proves, *Linus* was dead before *Peter* (c). *Irenæus* doth not say (as the Notes falsely cite him,) that *Linus* succeeded *Peter* in the Government of the universal Church (d); but only that *Peter* and *Paul* delivered the Administration of that Church to him, which they had founded at *Rome*; Which they might do in their Life time, while they went to preach in other places: The Epistle of *Ignatius* to *Mary Cassibolite*, and the Verses attributed to *Tertullian*, which they bring for proof of this Succession, are confessed to be spurious Tracts: *St. Hierom* is dubious, and upon the whole matter, there is no certainty who was Bishop of *Rome* next to the Apostles, and therefore the Romanists build on an ill Bottom, when they lay so great weight on their personal Succession.

§. 7: The like Blunder there is about the next Pope: The fabulous Pontifical makes *Cletus* succeed *Linus*, and gives us several Lives of *Cletus* and *Anacletus*, making them of several Nations, and to have been Popes at different times, putting *Clement* between them. Yet the aforesaid Learned Bishop of *Chester*, proves these were only two names of the same Person (e); But the Notes attempt to justify the forged Pontifical, by impudently affirming (f) that *Ignatius*, (*Anacletus* contemporary) *Irenæus*, *Eusebius*, *St. Augustine* and *Optatus*, were all mistaken, or all wronged by their Transcribers, who leave out *Cletus*: But every Candid Reader will

(c) Cestriens.  
diff. 2. cap. 1.

(f) Lab. pag. 74.  
Bin. pag. 25.  
col. 1.

## Part I. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

9

will rather believe the Mistake to be in the *Pontifical* (which is a meer heap of Errors) and in the Roman *Martyrology* and *Missal*, which blindly follow it, rather than in those Eminent and Ancient Fathers: And every one may see the Folly of the Romish Church, which Venerates two several Saints, on two several Days, one of which never had a real Being; for *Cletus* is but the abbreviation of *Anacletus* his Name.

§. 8. After this we have the Life of *Clement*, wherein the *Pontifical* makes him succeed *Cletus*, under those Consuls which were in Office the next year after *S. Peter's* Martyrdom, though he had assigned 13 years to *Linus* and *Cletus*, his pretended Predecessors (g); which years must all be expired in one years compass, if this Account be true; and one would admire the stupidity of this Author, who though he had placed *S. Peters* Death so many years before *Clement's* Entrance, as to leave room for two intermediate Popes; yet here again repeats his old Fable of *S. Peters* delivering the Bishopric of *Rome* to *Clement*; a sufficient proof there is neither Truth nor Certainty in the pretended Personal Succession of the first Popes.

(g) *Lab. pag. 75.*  
*Bin. pag. 25.*  
col. 1.

§. 9. From this Pope *Clement* down to the time of *Syriscus*, who lived 300 years after him, there are printed in these Editors, after every Popes Life, divers *Decretal Epistles*, pretended to be writ by the several Popes, and Vindicated by *Binius's* Notes annexed to them: Which were received in the Western Church for many Hundred years together as the genuine Decrees of these ancient and pious Popes, transcribed into the Canon Law; and cited for many Ages to justify the Usurpations, and defend the Corruptions of the Roman Church, to determine Causes and decide Controversies in Religion: And yet they are all notorious Forgeries; so that since Learning was revived, divers of the most Eminent Roman Writers have rejected them.

C

Card.

(h) *Cusan. de Concord. Cath.*  
13.

(i) *Baron. An.*  
865. §. 7. &c  
An. 102. § 6, 7

(k) *Labbé pag.*  
78.

(l) *Bin. pag. 26.*  
col. 1.

(m) *Hard. 2-  
gainst Jewel,  
pag. 22.*

(n) *Dr. James  
Cor. of Fath.  
Part I. pag. 4,  
20, & 69.*

Card. *Cusanus* affirms, *That being compared with the times in which they are pretended to have been Writ, they betray themselves* (h). *Baronius* calls them, *Late invented Evidences of no Credit, and Apocryphal* (i); yea, *Labbé* and *Cosartius* have in their Edition a Learned Preface to them, proving them to be forged (k): And in their Margin write almost against every Epistle, *This is suspected; This is Isidores Wares, &c.* and also note the very places of Authors who lived long after these Times, out of which large Passages in them are stolen *Verbatim*. Which clear Confession of our Adversaries may make some think it needless to confute them, and unnecessary to charge this Forgery upon the Roman Church: But I cannot think it fit wholly to pass them by; because *Turrian* the Jesuit had the Confidence to defend them all as genuine; and *Binius* in his Edition, not only vindicates them by a general Preface (l), but by particular Notes labours to prove most of them Authentic; and *Labbé* himself prints those Notes at large in his Edition, so that such as do not look into his Margin, may be deceived. Besides, this Confession of some Romanists comes too late to compensate for the injury done to the Truth, by their Churches approving them so long: And they still keep up the Supremacy, and all their corrupt Practices and Opinions, which were set up and cherished by these Forgeries; they now take away the Scaffolds, when the Building can stand alone; they execute the Traytor, but enjoy freely the benefit of his Treason. Moreover, while some Romanists condemn them, others go on to cite them for good Authority: *Harding* brags, he had proved many Points of Faith by the Epistles of *Clement Damasus*, *Julius Melchiades*, *Pontianus*, *Sixtus*, *Soter*, and *Symmachus* (m): *Dr. Tho. James* shews the particular corrupt Doctrines and Practices, which the late Roman Writers defend by the spurious Epistles of *Clement*, *Marcellus*, *Marcus*, and *Hormisdas* (n): And the Learned *Cook* with infinite diligence, hath cited the very Places of the Modern Champions for the Roman Opinions, and shewed what



## Part I. *Roman Forgeries in the Councils.*

11

what Doctrines and Practices they do maintain by these Forged Epistles (o). It is also well known; that the Late Scribes for that Religion do follow *Bellarmin* and Others, in citing these *Decretals* for good Authority, and that the Canon Law is in a great measure composed out of these Epistles; by which, Causes are determined at this day in all Popish Countries: Therefore till the Romanists raze them and the Notes in their defence, out of the Volumes of the Councils, and expunge all the false Notions taken hence, out of their Canon Law; yea, and leave citing them in their Disputes with us, we cannot think it needless to shew the apparent Forgery of them; but we will not enlarge so as to disprove the Particulars, but put together here our Evidence against them all.

(o) *Rob. Coci*  
*Censura Patr.*  
*per totum.*

§. 10. These Epistles, though pretended to be writ in the first four Centuries, were never heard of in the World till near 800 years after Christ: About which time came out a Collection of Councils under the name of *Isidore Hispalensis*; but whereas he died *An. 636*, and this Collector mentions the *XIth* Council of *Toledo* and the Sixth General Council, which were held near Fifty years after, this appears not to be the Work of that *Isidore*, but of one *Isidore Mercator*, and it was first brought into France by *Riculphus B. of Mentz*, in which Collection these *Decretal* Epistles first appeared; but the Learned *Hincmarus* of *Rheims* immediately discerned them to be an imposture, and Writ against them, as *Baronius* confesseth (p): But though he own the Cheat, he is not willing to grant the Roman Church had any hand in it, yet that is as clear as the Forgery; because *Hincmarus* was hated and prosecuted by the Pope, and forced at last to Recant his Censure of these Epistles; and not long after *Benedictus Levita* having Transcrib'd divers Passages out of them into his *Capitulars*, got them confirmed at *Rome*, which could not but cherish so advantageous a Fiction that supported the Supremacy, which they then did so hotly stickle for; and therefore

(p) *Baron. An.*  
*nal. An. 865.*  
*§. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.*

though they came first to the Birth in *Spain*; some conjecture they were all Hatched at *Rome*, whose evil Designs and Interest they are contrived to serve: But the Age was so Ignorant when they were Invented, that there is such infamous and convincing Marks of Forgery upon them, as makes it very easie to prove the Cheat beyond any possibility of doubting; and we will here put the principal of them together under their proper Heads.

- §. 11. First, The Style of these *Decretals* shews they were not writ within the four first Centuries, wherein (at *Rome* especially) they writ Latin in a much more Elegant Style than is to be found here, where the Phrases are modern, harsh, and sometimes barbarous, so that the Reader is often puzzled to reconcile them either to Grammar or Sense: As for Example, Pope Victor's Second Epistle (q), which of old began with *Enim*, and was mended by *Binius* with *Semper enim*; but still there is false Latin in it, viz. *aliquos nocere fratres velle* (r). The like barbarous Style may be observed in the two Epistles of *Pontianus* (s), and in many others: But the genuine Epistles of *Cornelius*, preserved in *Eusebius* and *S. Cyprian* (t), are writ in a more polite Style; and as *Labbé* notes, *These Epistles shew how much good Money differs from counterfeit, and how much Gold excels Counters*: The like difference there is between the Style of that genuine Epistle of *Clement* to the *Corinthians* (u), and those silly Forgeries put out in his Name in the very Front of these *Decretals* (w); from whence it undeniably follows, That the *Decretals* were not writ in the Ages wherein the Latin Tongue flourished, nor by those Popes whose Names they bear. And this is further manifest by divers Words, which were not used in the time of these Popes, but are often put into these Epistles: Such is *Religiositas* for *Piety*, and *Universitas* for *the World*, in the *Decretals* of *Dionysius* (x); such is *Miles* for a *Servant*, and *Senior* for a *Lord*, in the *Decrees* of Pope *Pius* (y), which are Words not heard of till the
- (q) *Lab.* p. 595.  
*Bin.* pag. 79.  
 col. 1.  
 (r) *Rob. Coci*  
*Censuræ* pag.  
 33.  
 (s) *Lab.* p. 622.  
*Bin.* pag. 90,  
 & 91.  
 (t) *Ep.* 3 & 5.  
*Cornel.*  
*Lab.* pag. 683,  
 &c.  
*Bin.* pag. 111,  
 112, 113.  
 (u) *Edit.* *Lab.*  
 pag. 116.  
 (w) *Lab.* p. 82,  
 &c.  
*Bin.* pag. 27, &c.  
 (x) *Lab.* p. 827.  
*Bin.* pag. 158.  
 (y) *Lab.* p. 576.  
*Bin.* p. 71. col. 2.

the time of the French Empire, in that sense: Such is the Phrase of *making Oblation to redeem mens Sins*, and the Name of the *Maß* in *Fabian's Decrees* (2). Pope *Gaius* his *Decretal Epistle* mentions *Pagans*, but that Name was not used for the *Gentils* till *Optatus Milevitanus* his time, who first used it in that Sense, saith *Baronius* (a). Moreover, innumerable places in these Epistles mention Primates and Patriarchs, Arch-Bishops and Metropolitans, &c. which Words were not used in the Christian Church in the time of those Popes, who are pretended to have writ about them; As for Example, The first Epistle of *Clement* (b), the second Epistle of *Anacletus* (c), and many others; but no Christian Writer ever used the Word *Patriarch* for a Christian Bishop till *Socrates Scholasticus*, who writ *An. 442* (d). In like manner we find the Word *Apo-criphary* in *Anacletus's* first Epistle (e), and also in the second Epistle of *Zepherine* (f); yet *Meursius* in his Glossary cannot find any elder Authority for it than *Constantine's* Donation (forged after that Emperor's time), and owns the Name was not heard of before, *Gloss. p. 43*. The Name of *Archdeacon* also is in *Clement's* second Epistle (g), and in Pope *Lucius's* Decrees (h); but the Office and Title did not come into the Church till many years after: And finally, the Name of a *Diocesan* for a Christian Bishop, is put into *Calixtus's* second Epistle (i), but was not used in that Sense till long after his time. All which prove these Epistles were writ in the later barbarous Ages, and not in the time of those Popes, whose Names they bear.

(2) *Lab. p. 650.*  
*Bin. pag. 101.*

(a) *Lab. p. 925.*  
*Bin. pag. 172.*  
*col. 2.*

(b) *Lab. pag. 91.*  
*Bin. pag. 30.*  
*col. 2.*

(c) *Lab. p. 526.*  
*Bin. pag. 47.*  
*col. 2.*

(d) *Beveridg.*  
*Annot. in Con-*  
*cil. Nicen.*

*Tom. II. p. 52.*

(e) *Lab. p. 511.*  
*Bin. pag. 42.*  
*col. 2.*

(f) *Lab. p. 606.*  
*Bin. pag. 82.*  
*col. 2.*

(g) *Lab. pag. 98.*  
*Bin. pag. 34.*  
*col. 2.*

(h) *Lab. p. 727.*  
*Bin. pag. 131.*  
*col. 2.*

(i) *Lab. p. 612.*  
*Bin. pag. 85.*  
*col. 1.*

§. 12. The same may be proved Secondly, by the Matter of these Epistles, which is no way suitable to those grave and Pious Popes, who lived in times when the Church was pestered with Heresies, and oppressed with Persecutions; yet these Epistles do not either confute those Heresies, nor comfort the Christians under Persecutions; But speak great Words of the Roman Supremacy, and of Appeals, of the exemption and privileges

- ledges of Bishops and Clergy Men, of splendid Altars and rich Vessels for Divine Administrations, and the like, which make it incredible they could be writ in an Age of suffering: Instances of this we have in *Clements* first Epistle (k); where he Orders Primates and Patriarchs, to be placed in such Cities as the Heathens, of Old had Arch-Flamins in: Whereas the Heathensthen had *Flamines* and Priests in all Cities: His third Epistle (l) is directed to all Princes greater and less, and Commands them to obey their Bishops: Whereas all Princes in the World at that time were Gentils: The like absurdity appears in *Calixtus* first Epistle, where he gives Laws to the Emperors and all others professing piety (m), as if *Heliogabulus* and *Caracalla* had been under his Command: And in the second Epistle of *Sixtus*, Anno. 260, who threatens to Excommunicate the Princes of Spain, who spoiled their Bishops (n), though all Princes then were Heathens: *Marcellinus* also in a time of Persecution, under a Heathen Emperor gives direction what is to be done by an Emperor professing the true Faith (o); Who can imagin, *Anacletus* Anno Dom. 104, should speak of Priests in little Villages, and of Cities which anciently had Primates and Patriarchs, or tell us in *Trajan's* time, That Rome had cast away her Heathen Rites (p)? Or that he should affirm the Christian people were generally Enemies to their Priests; and Command the Bishops to visit the Thresholds of S. Peter's Church (before it was Built (q)? ) Is it likely *Evaristus* the next Pope, should declare, That Children could not Inherit their Parents Estates, if they were not Baptized by a Christian Priest (r); or suppose Churches and Altars consecrated long before the Memory of any Man in the Parish (s)? Could Pope *Xystus* in *Adrian's* Persecution brag, that Rome was the Head over all Bishops, and also a Refuge to such as were spoiled by Christian People (t)? Were there in Pope *Hyginus* time, (as his Decrees pretend) More Churches and larger than the Revenue belonging to them could repair (u)? Is it propable Pope *Pius* should complain Anno 158, That Christians should Sacrilegiously
- (k) *Lab. p. 91.*  
*Bin. pag. 30.*
- (l) *Lab. p. 103.*  
*Bin. pag. 36.*  
*col. 1.*
- (m) *Lab. p. 609.*  
*Bin. pag. 83.*  
*col. 2.*
- (n) *Lab. p. 822.*  
*Bin. pag. 157.*  
*col. 1.*
- (o) *Lab. p. 934.*  
*Bin. pag. 176.*  
*col. 2.*
- (p) *Lab. p. 528.*  
*Bin. pag. 49.*
- (q) *Decreta ejus*  
*Lab. pag. 532.*  
*Bin. pag. 51.*  
*col. 2.*
- (r) *Lab. p. 533.*  
*Bin. pag. 52.*  
*col. 1.*
- (s) *Lab. p. 541.*  
*Bin. pag. 54.*  
*col. 1.*
- (t) *Lab. p. 558.*  
*Bin. pag. 62.*  
*col. 2.*
- (u) *Lab. p. 568.*  
*Bin. pag. 67.*  
*col. 2.*

*legiously take away whole Farms dedicated to Pious Uses?*

Yet this complaint is found in his second Epistle (w); (w) *Lab. p. 574.*

And *Binius* Notes justify this by a forged Decretal of *Urban* the First, and by proving that in the time of *Constantine* (140 Years after) the Heathens had taken Houses from the Christians: The Decree for Vailing Nuns at 25 years of Age must be of later time, because it is certain no Nuns were vailed then, nor were any under Sixty years Old allowed to profess Virginity (x): When all (x) *Cestriens. diff. 2. cap. 6.*

Christians were so constantly present at Divine Offices, and received the Sacrament Weekly; what need was there for Pope *Soter* to decree, No Priest should say Mass unless two were present, and that all should Communicate on Maunday-Thurs day (y)? How could there be (y) *Lab. p. 587.*

Secular Laws forbidding the People to conspire against their Bishop, as *Calixtus* Decretal pretends (z)? or how could (z) *Lab. p. 612.*

he mention the Laws of the Roman and Greek Emperors, so long before the Empire was divided (a)? Had Bishops (a) *Lab. p. 612.*

in Pope *Urban's* time power to Banish and Imprison the Sa- (a) *Ibid.*

crilegious? or had they high Seats in the form of a Throne, Erected for them in Churches, as his Epistle pretends (b)? (b) *Lab. p. 618.*

Could the next Pope by his Decree hinder Heathens and Enemies to the Christian Clergy from accusing them? as the first Epistle of *Pontianus* gives out (c). *Antherus* Epistle (c) *Lab. p. 623.*

charges Bishops in those times with changing their Churches out of ambition and covetousness (d), even (d) *Lab. p. 634.*

while nothing but Martyrdom was to be got by being a Bishop: And *Fabian* is made to charge the Faithful, with (d) *Lab. p. 634.*

spoiling their Bishops, and citing them before the Lay-Tribunals (e); which is not credible of the Christians of (e) *Lab. p. 636.*

that Age: *Cornelius* his genuine Epistle saith; The (e) *Lab. p. 636.*

Christians durst not meet at Prayers in any known Rooms, no (e) *Lab. p. 636.*

not in Cellars under ground (f). But the Pontifical and (f) *Lab. p. 682.*

one of his Forged Decretals, pretend that this same (f) *Lab. p. 682.*

Pope had liberty to Bury the Apostle *S. Peter's* Body in (f) *Lab. p. 682.*

*Apollo's* Temple, the Vatican and the golden Mount, (f) *Lab. p. 682.*

that is, in three places (I suppose) at once (g): *Lucius* a (g) *Lab. p. 668.*

Martyred Pope makes it a wonder, that in his days (g) *Lab. p. 668.*

Churches should be spoiled of their Oblations and Ministers (g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(g) *Lab. p. 668.*

(h) *Lab.* p. 721. vexed (h); Pope Stephen threatens to make Slaves of Clerks, *Bin.* pag. 129. who accuse their Bishop, and forbids Lay-men to complain of the Clergy (i); Doth it consist with the poverty of those Ages, for Eutychianus to decree That Martyrs should be Buried in Purple (k)? or with its charity, for the same (k) *Lab.* p. 913. Pope to forbid Christians to pray for Hereticks (l); *Bin.* pag. 167. when our Lord bids them pray for their Enemies? I should tire the Reader and my self, if I proceeded to Rake together any more Instances; and these may suffice to shew, That these Epistles were not writ in those early Ages.

§. 13. Thirdly, The same may be proved from the many Absurdities found in these Decretals, arguing the Author to be Illiterate and Ignorant; Whereas the Popes, whose Names they falsely bear, were prudent and Learned Men; however well skilled in Holy Scripture: Yet *Anacletus* is made to say, that the Apostles chose the LXX Disciples (m), which the Gospel affirms were chosen by Christ himself: He also weakly derives *Cephas* (the Syriac Name of *Peter*, signifying a Stone) from the Greek word *Κεφαλη*, and saith it signifies a Head, and proves *Peter's* Supremacy by this silly mistake (n): It looks very ridiculously in Pope *Antherus* in his Epistle to say, it is not fit for one in my Mean condition to judge others, nor to say any thing of the Ministers of the Churches (o); but indeed the Forger stole these Words out of S. Hieroms first Epistle to *Heliodorus*, and foolishly applied them to the Pope: The Decretal of *Stephen* tells the Gallican Church, what the Holy Apostolic and Universal Church had undertaken to observe, as if they had been no part of the Universal Church (p): But nothing is more Ridiculous than the foolish Expositions of Scripture, which Popes ought to interpret Infalibly; but these Epistles make Pope *Alexander* prove, that Holy-water doth sanctify, by *Heb.* ix. 13, 14. where the Ashes of an Heifer are said to Purify the unclean, and the Blood of Christ to purge the Conscience: And he interprets *Hof.* iv. 8. where the Priests are said to Eat



eat up the Sins of the People, of blotting out their Sins by their Prayers(q); Pope Pius proves Bishops are only to be judged by God, because (John II.) Christ drove the Buyers and Sellers out of the Temple with his own hands(r). Pope Anicetus proves, Priests ought to shave their Crowns, because S. Paul saith, *It is a shame for Men to have long hair*, 1 Cor. XI. (s); which the Apostle speaks of Lay-men as well as Clergy-men, and so the same Logic would prove, that *Lay-men also should shave their Crowns*. Pope Soter proves, that Nuns must not touch the Holy Vessels, by S. Pauls saying, 2 Cor. XI. *He had espoused the Corinthians (both Men and Women) to one Husband, even Christ* (t). Pope Stephen proves, That Bishops ought not to be disturbed, by that place in the Psalms, *The Heavens declare the glory of God, and the Firmament sheweth his handy work* (u); And to name no More, Pope Felix is very happy in that he can make out, That we ought not to persecute and disturb Our Brethren, from Rom. V. 1, 2. *When we were Enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son*: And from Matb. X. *Fear not them which can kill the body, &c.* he proves, *We must not persecute nor disturb Preachers and Doctors, because their Souls do not dye with their Bodies* (w). All these impertinent Inferences from Holy Scripture, shew the Forger of these Epistles was some ignorant and impudent Impostor; but none can suppose those holy Primitive Bishops would abuse Scripture and themselves at this rate.

(q) Epist. Alex. 1.

Bin. pag. 57, &amp;c.

Ep. 2. Bin. p. 59.

(r) Lab. p. 571.

Bin. pag. 68.

col. 2.

(s) Lab. p. 581.

Bin. pag. 72.

col. 2.

(t) Lab. p. 584.

Bin. pag. 75.

col. 1.

(u) Lab. p. 732.

Bin. pag. 134.

col. 1.

(w) Lab. p. 906.

Bin. pag. 164.

col. 2.

§. 14. Fourthly, this further appears, From many Quotations in these Epistles, which are taken *verbatim* out of Authors, that lived and writ long after all these Popes were dead, in whose Names these Epistles are forged; wherefore they could not write them. \* *De Marca* makes this an infallible Note, in that these Epistles do all generally cite Scripture, according to S. *Hieroms* Translation \*, which was not made in their days; yet *Clement* in his 4th and 5th Epistles, *Evaristus* in both his Epistles, *Telesphorus* in

lib. 3. cap. 5.

his Decretal, and indeed all the rest of them who have occasion to quote Scripture, do use the very Words of S. Hierom, and that sometimes for a whole Page together, as the Reader will find by comparing these Quotations with the Vulgar Latin Bible. But Learned Men know that the Latin Fathers, who lived before S. Hierom's Translation was extant, used another Version very different from that, and even Pope Cornelius in that genuine Epistle of his, which is preserved in S. Cyprian, doth not follow S. Hierom's Translation (x); but his Forged ones do: Which is a Proof undeniable, That he who Forged these Epistles, lived after S. Hierom's Translation was grown common. Besides; Anacletus is made to cite a long Passage *verbatim* out of S. Hierom's Epistle to Nepetian, which was writ almost 300 years after his time (y). Pope Eleutherius cites a Law out of the Theodosian Code, *Judicantem cuncta rimari oportet*, &c. (z), which was made 300 years after this Popes death, and this convinced Contius and Baronius, that this Epistle was Forged after Theodosius his Reign; yet Binius hath the Impudence to say, *Perhaps the Code borrowed this Passage from the Epistle*; but Labbé is so ashamed of this bold Falshood, that in his Margen he writes, *Binius in this is mistaken*; and he had reason for that Note, since this is not the only place in the feigned Decretals where the Code is cited. Labbé owns that the second forged Epistle for Pope Eutychianus quotes a Law *verbatim* out of Cod. Theod. lib. 9. Tit. 1, & 2. (a). Pope Zepherine also cites Imperial Laws and Edicts, *Forbidding Men to cite a Bishop despoiled of his goods, into any Secular Judicature, till all were restored* (b); the same Passage also is cited out of the Secular Laws in Pope Stephen's second Epistle (c). But it is most certain there could be no such Laws in these Popes times who lived under Pagan Emperors; nor a Law to forbid the People to conspire against their Bishops, which yet Calixtus cites in his second Epistle (d). Moreover, Antherus cites a long Passage, word for word, out of S. Hierom's Epistle

(x) Lab. p. 683.  
Bin. pag. 113.  
col. 2.

(y) Ep. 3. Anacleti, Lab. 529.  
Bin. 49.  
(z) Lab. p. 588.  
Bin. pag. 76.  
col. 1.

(a) Lab. p. 917.  
Bin. pag. 169.  
col. 2.  
(b) Lab. p. 606.  
Bin. pag. 82.  
col. 2.  
(c) Lab. p. 732.  
Bin. pag. 134.  
col. 1.

(d) Lab. p. 612.  
Bin. pag. 85.  
col. 1.

to *Heliodorus* (e); Pope *Lucius* is made to use (as *Labbe* (e) *Lab.* p. 630. confesseth) the Words of his Successor *Agatho*, in the *Bin.* pag. 92. Sixth Council of *Constantinople*, 300 years after (f): (f) *Lab.* p. 721. And yet *Bellarmin* cites this place of the Forged Epistle *Bin.* pag. 129. twice, to prove the Pope's Infallibility, *Bell. de Rom.* col. 1. *Pontif.* 1.4.c.3. & *de Verb. Dei*, lib. 3. cap. 5. Pope *Sixtus* the Second, His first Epistle is stolen most of it out of *Ishacius* and *Varimadus*, who lived many Ages after him (g). (g) *Lab.* p. 820. In *Eutychianus*'s first Epistle, there are two whole Pages *Bin.* pag. 156. transcribed out of his Successor, Pope *Leo*'s 97th Epistle (h): And *Gaius* his Decretal Epistle, steals two (h) *Lab.* p. 914. large Passages from the same Pope *Leo*'s twelfth Sermon *Bin.* pag. 168. on the Passion, and his 97th Epistle (i). *col.* 1. Finally, who- (i) *Lab.* p. 925. soever will take pains to observe *Labbe*'s Margen shall *Bin.* pag. 172. find, that he with great diligence hath marked in the *col.* 2. Margen of all these Forged Epistles; the very places of later Authors out of which they are stolen, and transcribed by their cheating Composer, who patcht them up together out of the Writings of *S. Hilary*, *S. Hierem*, Pope *Leo*, *Innocent*, *Gelasius*, and *Gregory*, &c. who lived many years after all these Popes were dead, which is an Unanswerable Proof, that they could not be writ by those whose Names they bear.

§ 15. Fifthly, Those Popes could not but know their own Times; and if they had writ them, they could not have been mistaken in Chronology, or in the Date of their Epistles; but the Forger of them had so little skill in the Times for which he invented them, that he is almost every where erroneous in his Computation. The two first Epistles of *Clement* are written to *S. James* after *S. Peter*'s death; yet it is confessed by *Binius*, *S. James* dyed six or seven years before *S. Peter*. *Binius* would solve this by saying, *The Name of James crept into the Title instead of Simeon*; but alas! the Name of *James* is repeated often in the very Body of the Epistles, and that proves them Forged (k). The Names of the Consuls also by which most of these Epistles are Dated, must have been right if they had

(k) *Lab.* p. 82. & pag. 98. *Bin.* pag. 27, & pag. 34.

been writ by these old Bishops of Rome, who could not be ignorant of the true Consuls in their own time; but alas! they are so generally false, that *Binus* in his Notes, in vain labours to excuse some few of them, and is forced to own the rest to be false; so that *Surius* was more cunning to leave all the Consuls Names out of his Edition, *Because* (he saith) *Calvin takes occasion from thence to despise all the Epistles* (1); and doubtless the Dates are as true as the Epistles, both having sufficient Marks upon them of a Modern Impostor, unskilled in those Times. And it is evident, that the *Pontifical* names the same false Consuls, so that either one Author forged the Popes Lives and their Epistles, or the Inventer of these Epistles took the Consuls Names so constantly from the *Pontifical*, that he imitates him in false-spelling the Consuls names, and in joyning Men who were never Consuls together; yea, because that Fabulous *Pontifical* usually Names no Consuls, but those in Office at Every Popes Entrance and Death, This Forger of the Epistles dates them all either by the first or last Consuls of every Pope, as if all the Popes had only written Epistles in their first and last years: A Few Examples of these Errors shall suffice.

(1) *Præfat. Laur.*  
*Surii ap. Lab.*  
*Tom. I. pag. 13.*

The *Pontifical* makes Pope *Euaristus* to enter when *Valens* and *Vetus* were Consuls, and to be martyred when *Gallus* and *Bradua* were Consuls, and so the Forger dates his first Epistle by the names of his first Consuls, and the second Epistle by the Consuls of his last year; But alas! both the *Pontifical* and Epistles are woefully mistaken, since *Euaristus* (as *Baronius* proves) entred the 13th year of *Trajan*, that is, fourteen years after the Consulship of *Valens* and *Vetus*, and two years after the Consulship of *Gallus* and *Bradua*; so that by this Account he writ Decretal Epistles long before he was Pope (m): So also, whereas Pope *Alexander* really sat in *Adrian* the Emperors time, and *Trajan* was dead before his entrance, yet one of his Epistles is dated with *Trajan* as one Consul, and *Helia-*

(m) *Lab. p. 532.*  
*Bis. pag. 51.*  
*col. 2.*

## Part I. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

21

*nus* as the other; but these two were never Consuls together (n): And his second Epistle is dated by the Consuls of *Adrian's* first year, whereas Pope *Alexander* came but into his See in *Adrian's* third year. I will not trouble my self with any more Instances, because there are none of these Dates true, and many of them with the *Pontifical* (which guides the Forgery) so grossly false, as to make Popes write Epistles before they were chosen, and after they were dead (o); which is an undeniable Evidence, that the Inventer of these Epistles was a Modern Cheat, ignorant of the true Times both of the Consuls and the Popes. There are other Errors also besides the Dates, which shew, the Bungling Author of these Epistles neither understood Chronology nor History. The *Pontifical*, before it was corrected, had made *Anicetus* Pope, *Pius* his Predecessor; and therefore *Pius* his third Epistle doth not reckon him among the Priests at *Rome*, but puts in *Eleutherius* as one of *Pius* his Presbyters (p), who was but a Deacon in the time of his Successor *Anicetus* (q). The same Epistle makes *Cerintus* the Heretic to be alive, and busie at *Rome* in seducing Men, *An.166*; yet *Binius* before tells us he was present in the Synod at *Hierusalem An. Christi 51*, at which Synod, if he were but Nineteen years of Age, he must in *Pius* his time have been 130, which is incredible; but *Binius* saith, this may be believed, because the first Epistle of *Pius* mentions *Hermes* (named by *S. Paul*, *Rom. XVI.*) who set forth a Book about this time *An.158*; which *Hermes*, if he were but only 34 year old *An.Christi 62*, when *S. Paul* writ his Epistle to the *Romans*, must be 130 years of Age, when he set forth this Book; but in conclusion, the Story of *Hermes* and his Apocryphal Book is a meer Fable, stolen out of the *Pontifical* (r), and *Binius* hath no way to defend one of these Fictions, but with another equally absurd. Again, Pope *Victor* is made to summon one *Theophilus* (Bishop of *Alexandria*) to a Council at *Rome*; but there was no *Theophilus* Bishop there in *Victor's* time, *Severus* was then Bishop of that See, and this *Theophilus*

was

(n) Lab. p. 542.  
Bin. pag. 55.  
col. 2.

(o) Exemp<sup>i</sup>  
gratia,  
Telephori Ep. 1.  
Aniceti Ep. 1.  
Zepherin. 1 & 2.  
Pontiani Ep. 2.  
Fabiani Ep. 3.  
Cornelii Ep. 1, 2.  
& in multis  
aliis.

(p) Lab. p. 576.  
Bin. pag. 70.  
col. 2.  
(q) Euseb. hist.  
lib. 4. cap. 22. &  
Brev. Rom.  
Maiti 26.

(r) Lab. p. 572.  
Bin. pag. 68.  
col. 2.

*See Works.*  
*Epistles of the*  
*Popes of the*  
*1st Century*

(s) *Lab. p. 593.*  
*Bin. pag. 78.*  
 col. 1.  
*Euseb. lib. 5.*  
 cap. 22.  
 (t) *Lab. p. 630.*  
*Bin. pag. 92.*  
 col. 2.  
 (u) *Dodwel. 2p.*  
*Ceslr. diss. 2.*  
 cap. 6.  
 (w) *Lab. p. 636.*  
*Bin. pag. 92.*  
 col. 2.  
 (x) *Baron.*  
*An. 238. §. 9.*

was Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Palestine* (s); but if *Victor* had really writ this Epistle, he could not have made so gross a Mistake: In like manner *Antherus* Epistle mentions one *Eusebius*, as then Bishop of *Alexandria* (t), who was not Bishop there till two or three Ages after (u). The first Epistle of Pope *Fabian*, dated in his first year, mentions *Novatus* the Heretic coming out of *Africa* to *Rome*, and seducing *Novatian*, with others (w); but *Baronius* out of *Eusebius* and *S. Cyprian* assures us, that *Novatus* came not to *Rome* till Fifteen years after (x). Wherefore these Epistles were devised by a later Author, who knew neither the History nor Chronology of those Ages for which he invented these Epistles; but had only the Fabulous *Pontifical* in his eye, and follows it in all its Errors and Absurdities: So that since the *Pontifical* makes Pope *Hyginus* an *Athenian*, Pope *Pius* an *Italian*, and Pope *Soter* born in *Campania*; *Isidore* forges three Epistles for *Hyginus*, To the *Athenians*; for *Pius*, To his *Italian Brethren*; for *Soter*, To all the *Campanians*: And when the *Pontifical* falsly devises several Superstitious Rites, begun in the corrupt Ages, and other Usages, to have been first appointed by some of the Ancient Popes, the said *Isidore* upon that always forges an Epistle in those Popes Names to enjoin those Rites; and hence Pope *Alexander* writes an Epistle about Holy-Water (y); *Sixtus*, about none but the Clergies touching Consecrated Vessels (z); *Telephorus*, about keeping *Lent* Seven Weeks (a); *Pius*, about keeping *Easter* upon Sunday (b); *Anicetus*, about Shaving Priests Crowns (c); *Calixtus*, about four Ember Weeks (d); and so did other Popes, whereas most of these Rites were settled long after, and only prove these Epistles were forged by *Isidore*.

(y) Epist. 1. *Alexander.*  
 (z) *Sixti* Ep. 2.  
 (a) *Telephor.*  
 Ep. 1.  
 (b) *Pii* Ep. 1.  
 (c) *Aniceti*  
 Epist. 1.  
 (d) *Calixti*  
 Epist. 1.



§. 16. Now though it be so apparent and undeniable, that these Epistles are Forged, and consequently of no Authority; yet the Roman Church hath made great use of them in the Ignorant Ages: For *Binius* notes all along in his Margen, what Sections of them are transcribed into their Canon Law; and even in later times their Writers against the Protestants do commonly cite their Infamous Impostures, to prove the Supremacy of the Pope, his Infallibility, and right to Appeals; as also for the exemption of the Clergy, their Celibacy and Habits, and to prove *their Maß with its Ceremonies, Auricular Confession, Apocryphal Books, Tradition, Chrism, Veneration of Relicks and Martyrs, &c.* and *Cook* in his *Censura Patrum*, hath noted the several Epistles, and the Authors which cite them, saving us the labour of instancing: And therefore we will only make a few general Observations upon this matter, and so dismis these Forgeries.

Observ. I. That since the Romanists have no other genuine Ancient Authors, to prove these New Doctrines and Practices by; but are forced generally to place these apparent Forgeries in the Fore-front of all their Authorities, we may conclude these Points of their Religion are all Innovations, unheard of in the Primitive Ages; so that *Isidore* was forced to invent these Epistles almost 800 years after Christ, to give some shew of Antiquity to them; and these Points were in those Ignorant Times mistaken by this means for Primitive Usages and Opinions, and so got footing in the World under that disguise; but now that the Fallacy is discovered, the Doctrines and Practices ought to be disowned as well, as the Epistles on which they are built.

Observ. II. There are many other Points of the Roman Religion, which are not so much as mentioned in any of these Forged Epistles, such as *Worship of Images, Formal Praying to the Saints, and to the Virgin Mary; Transubstantiation, Half-Communion, and Adoration*

tion of the Host, Purgatory, Indulgences, and Justification by Merits, with some others. Now these are so New, that in *Isidore's* time, when he invented these Epistles they were not heard of nor received, no not in the Roman Church; for if they had, no doubt this Impostor, who was so zealous to get Credit for all the Opinions and Usages of that Church which he knew of, would have made some Popes write Epistles to justify these also, and his silence concerning them makes it more than probable, that these were all invented since the year of Christ 800.

Observ. III. Though the later Romanists frequently cite these Forged *Decretals*, yet no genuine Author or Historian for Seven hundred years after Christ did ever Quote or Mention them, no not so much as any of the Popes themselves in all that Period. Now it is morally impossible so many important Points should be so clearly decided by so many Ancient Bishops of so Famous a Church, and yet no Author ever take notice of it. And doubtless when the Popes attempted to be Supreme, and claimed Appeals about the year 400, *Zosimus* and *Boniface*, who quarrelled with the Eastern and African Bishops about these Points, and were so hard put to it for Evidence, as to feign some private Canons were made at the first general Council of *Nice*, would certainly have cited these Epistles, which are so clear Evidence for their pretences, if they had either seen or heard of them; but they do not once name them in all that Controversie, which shews they were not then in being; yea, those who know Church History, do clearly discern, that the main Points settled by these Epistles, were things disputed of about the Seventh and Eighth Centuries, a little before *Isidore's* time; and therefore these Forgeries must never be cited for to prove any Point to be Ancient or Primitive.

§. 17. Obf. IV. Though the Inventer of thefe Epiftles was fo zealous a Bigot for the Roman Caufe, yet many things are to be found in them, which contradict the prefent Tenents of that Church. For whereas the Pope now claims an Universal Supremacy even over *Jerufalem* it felf; *Clement's* firft Epiftle is directed to *James the Bifhop of Bifhop's*, Ruling the Hebrew Church at *Jerufalem*, and all the Churches every where founded by Divine providence (e). *Anacletus* firft Epiftle orders all the Clergy (e) *Lab. pag. 82. Bin. pag. 27.* prefent to receive, under pain of Excommunication (f); which (f) *Lab. p. 511. Bin. pag. 42.* is not obferved now in the Roman Church: Pope *Telephus* orders a Maff on the Night before Chriftmas, and (g) *Lab. p. 562. Bin. pag. 64.* forbids any to begin Maffs, before nine a Clock (g); But *Binius* confeffes their Church doth not now obferve either of thefe Orders: Pope *Hyginus* forbids all foreign Jurifdiction, becaufe it is unfit, they fhould be Judged abroad, who have Judges at home (h); So the third Epiftle of Pope *Fabian*, appoints that every Caufe fhall be tried where the Crime is committed; which paffage is alfo in a genuine Epiftle of *S. Cyprian* to *Cornelius* (i). And all foreign Jurifdiction is again forbid in Pope *Felix* his fecond Epiftle (k), which paffages do utterly deftroy Appeals to *Rome*, unlefs they can prove all the Crimes in the World are committed there: The fecond Epiftle of *Fabian* allows the People to reprove their Bifhop if he Err in matters of Faith (l); the fame Liberty alfo is given to the People, in *Cornelius* fecond Epiftle (m); which feems to make the People Judges in Matter of Faith, a thing which the Modern Romanifts charge upon the Proteftants as a great Error: From thefe and many other paffages we may fee, that thefe Impoftures do not in all Points agree with the prefent Roman Church.

§. 18. I have now done with the Epiftles themfelves, and proved them to be apparent Forgeries; I will only give the Reader fome cautions about thofe partial Notes, printed on them both in *Binius* and *Labbè*, which though they frequently correct, confute and alter divers paf-

sages in these Epistles; Yet if any thing look kindly upon the Roman Church, they magnifie and vindicate it; but if it seem to condemn any of their Usages, they reject and slight it: For Example, Pope *Pius* cites *Coloss.* XI. 18. against worshipping Angels, and the Notes, reject both *S. Hierom's* and *Theodore's* Exposition of the place, as Reflecting on their Churches practice, adding that *S. Paul* condemned *Cerintbus* in that place, for giving too much Honour to Angels; Yet *Binius* soon after tells us that *Cerintbus* was so far from Teaching they were to be Adored, that he thought they were to be Hated

(n) Not *Bin.*  
in 1. Ep. *Pii.*  
*Lab.* pag. 571.  
*Bin.* pag. 68.  
(o) *Lab.* p. 605.  
*Bin.* pag. 81.  
col. 2.

as Authors of Evil (n). Pope *Zepherine* cites the Apostolical Canons for the Priviledges of his See, and saith there were but Seventy of them (o): But *Binius* in his Notes saith he refers to the Seventy third Canon: Yet if the Reader consult that Seventy third Canon, the Pope's See is not named there; yea, that Canon forbids a Bishop to Appeal from his Neighbor Bishop, unless it be to a Council: Out of *Calixtus* first Epistle which *Labbe* owns to be a manifest Forgery; *Binius* Notes cite a Testimoy for the Supremacy, calling it an evident Testimony and

(p) *Lab.* p. 609.  
*Bin.* pag. 83.  
col. 2.  
(q) *Lab.* p. 624.  
*Bin.* pag. 90.  
col. 1.

worthy to be Noted (p); *Pontianus* in his Exile brags, ridiculouly about the Dignity of Priests, in his second Epistle (q). And *Binius* his Notes vindicate this improbable Forgery by a spurious Epistle attributed to *Ignatius*, which saith—the Laity must be subject to the Deacons: but *Binius* cites it thus—The Laity, of which number are all Kings, even the most Christian Kings, must be subject to the Deacons; by which falsifying the Quotation, he makes the meanest Deacon in the Roman Church superior to the French King: Again, in the Vacancy after *Fabian*, the

(r) *Lab.* p. 654.  
*Bin.* pag. 103.  
col. 1.

Clergy of Rome and *S. Cyprian* writ to each other (r): Where though the Roman Clergy write with all respect to the Clergy of *Carthage*, and give them humble Advice, not Commands; yea, and thank *S. Cyprian* for his humility, in acquainting them with his Affairs, not as Judges of his concerns, but Partners in his Counsels. *Binius* notes that these Letters do sufficiently shew the Prerogative of the Roman Church—and that *S. Cyprian* not only desired the

Coun.

## Part I. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

27

*Council, but submitted to the Judgement of Rome.* The first Epistle of *Cornelius* tells a false story out of the Pontifical about his removing the Bodies of *S. Peter and Paul*; and though *Binius* own this part of the Epistle to be Forged; Yet in his Notes on the Pontifical (s), he strives to reconcile the differing ways of relating this Fabulous Translation, and flies to Miracles to make those Lies hang together. *Cornelius* third Epistle is genuine, being preserved in Greek by *Eusebius*, and yet *Binius* prints a corrupt Latin Version with it, which where the Greek speaks of one Bishop in a Catholic Church—Reads it—in this Catholic Church; and the Notes (t) impudently prove by this Corruption, that the Pope is the sole Bishop of the whole Catholic Church: Of which *Labbe* was so much ashamed, that he prints *Valesius's* Latin Version of this Epistle, wherein the ground of *Binius* his Observation is quite taken away. *S. Cyprian* hath several Epistles printed among the Decretals, wherein are many things which overthrow the Roman Supremacy and Infallibility, upon which no remark is placed, but an obscure passage wherein *S. Cyprian* saith, that whether he or *Cornelius* should be the Survivor, must continue his Payers for the afflicted Christians (u). There it is impertinently noted, That the deceased pray for the living: Pope *Stephen's* second Epistle asserts, *Primates were in use before Christianity* (w). *Binius* in his Notes out of *Baronius*, saith *Herodotus* confesses the same thing; but *Labbe* declares that some body had imposed upon *Baronius*, for there is no such thing to be found in *Herodotus*; and *Adrian in Vopiscus* (his other Authority) evidently speaks of the Christian Bishop of *Alexandria* (x): Wherefore Pope *Stephen*, or he that made the Epistle for him, was mistaken. It is an impudent thing also in *Binius* to note upon one of *S. Cyprian's* Letters about *Basiliides* and *Martialis*, You see the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome: For these two Bishops were justly condemned in Spain, and unjustly absolved by the Pope, after which *S. Cyprian* condemns them again, only certifying the Bishop of Rome that he had justly nulled his Absolution; so that we may

(s) Lab. p. 667.  
Bin. pag. 108.  
col. 1.

(t) Bin. p. 112.  
col. 2.

(u) Lab. p. 703.  
Bin. pag. 120.

(w) Lab. p. 732.  
Bin. pag. 134.  
col. 1.

(x) Scriptor.  
Hisor. August.  
pag. 960.

(y) *Bin. p. 136. col. 1.* rather note, You see the *Primacy of the Bishop of Carthage* (y). Pope *Eutychianus* first Epistle following the Erroneous Pontifical (x), Orders that only Beans and Grapes shall be offered on the Altar: *Binius* saith this is the Fourth Canon of the Apostles, whereas that fourth Canon doth not name Beans, and the Third Canon forbids all kind of Pulse to be offered on the Altar; so that the Impostor was deceived, and *Binius* becomes Ridiculous by attempting to defend him: I shall not need produce any more instances, these will suffice to warn those who study the Councils, not to rely upon any thing in these Notes, which are so full of partiality and Errors, of weak reasonings and false Quotations, of ignorant and wilful Mistakes, that there is little heed to be given to them.

§. 19. I doubt I have been too tedious in discovering the Forgeries of these Decretal Epistles; but the Reader must consider they take up the greatest part of this first Period in the Volumes of the Councils, and we have here considered them all together: And now we have nothing to observe in this Century, except the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which are left out in *Binius*, but printed in *Labbe*, in Greek and Latin, next after *Clement's* genuine Epistle to the *Corinthians*: Now the Constitutions are a very ancient Forgery, compiled about the end of the Fourth, and beginning of the Fifth Century, of the Rites of which Ages they give a very good account, and have little or nothing in them, to justify the more Modern Corruptions of *Rome*; for which cause it is likely *Binius* omitted them: But if we know before-hand that the Apostles did not make them, nor *Clement* Bishop of *Rome* collect them, and can pardon the boldness of making the Apostles the speakers, they are useful to be read, as a writing composed in the Fourth or Fifth Age.



## C H A P. II.

*Of the Forgeries in the Second Century.*

§. I. **T**His Period begins with the Life of *Anacletus*, who was made Pope, as they say, *An. 104.* but the Fabulous *Pontifical* brings him in, the 10th Consulship of *Domitian*, that is, just upon the fictitious *Cletus* his death, and before *Clement* entred, who yet is there said to be his Predecessor; so blundered and uncertain is that ignorant Writer; yet, except what he saith, no other Author mentions any deeds of *Anacletus*; and though *Binius* in his Notes affirm, *Anacletus was most famous for many eminent deeds* (s), yet he cannot name one of them. (a) *Lab. p. 511. Bin. pag. 42. col. 1.*

*Evaristus* his Life follows, whom the *Pontifical* and the *Breviary* of *Sixtus* the Fifth (b), make to have been Pope in the time of *Domitian*, *Nerva* and *Trajan*; but *Binius* out of *Baronius* takes upon him to correct both the *Pontifical* and the *Roman Office* also, assuring us he began in the 13th year of *Trajan*; but alas! these first Bishops of *Rome* were so obscure, that nothing but their Name is upon Record in Authentic Authors. And what is said in the *Pontifical*, and the Notes, concerning their several Parents, Countries, times of sitting in that See, and all their Actions almost, are meer Impositions of later Ages, as the Learned Dr. *Pierfon* proves in his afore-cited Posthumous Dissertation. (b) *Lab. p. 532. Bin. pag. 51. col. 2.*

*Alexander's* Life is next, wherein *Binius* again corrects the *Pontifical* and the *Breviary*; which say, *He Ruled the Church in the days of Trajan* (c); affirming, he entred not On the Papacy till *Adrian's* time: But there was more need to Correct the *Breviary* of his Infallible Church, for those fabulous Lessons it orders to be read in the Church on this Popes day, about *Alexander's* converting *Hermes* a Praefect of *Rome*, *Quintinus* (c) *Lab. p. 541. Bin. pag. 55. col. 1. Brev. Sixt. 5. in Maii 3.*

(d) *Cestrius*.  
dissert. posthum.  
diss. 2. cap. 7.  
pag. 227.

*rinus* a Tribune and *Balbina* his Daughter, who also is Sainted; yet after all, there were no such persons in those Offices in *Rome* at that time (d); and the whole Story is a Fiction taken out of a fabulous Tract called the *Acts* of *Alexander*, yet this Legend *Binius's* Notes defend.

(e) *Euseb.* lib. 4.  
c. 5.  
(f) *Lab.* p. 554.  
*Bin.* pag. 60.  
col. 2.

Of *Xystus*, the next Pope, nothing is memorable, but that he is said by the *Pontifical* to be a Martyr. *Eusebius* saith, he died in *Adrian's* Twelfth year, and mentions not his Martyrdom (e); but *Binius* contradicts him, and will have him to suffer in the 3d year of *Antoninus* (f); and this without any Authority for it, but his own.

† *Euseb.* ut  
supr.

(g) *Lab.* p. 559.  
*Bin.* pag. 63.  
col. 2.

*Telephorus*, according to *Eusebius*, was the Seventh Pope from *St. Peter*, and came in the Twelfth year of *Adrian* †, that is, *An.* 130. But *Binius* following the *Pontifical*, makes him the Eighth Pope, and saith he entered the Third year of *Antoninus*, that is, Twelve years after; and in the Notes on his Life (g), upon the *Pontificals* saying, he Ordained Thirteen Bishops in his Eleven years, he observes, that these Bishops were to be sent into divers parts of the World; from whence (he saith) it is clear that the Pope was to take care not of *Rome only*, but the whole World. But first, no inference from so fabulous an Author, as the *Pontifical*, can be clear: And secondly, if there were so many Bishops really Ordained by Popes, as the *Pontifical* doth pretend, there are but Sixty three Bishops reckoned by him from *S. Peter's* death to this time, which is near 100 years. From whence (if we grant the Matter of Fact) it is rather clear, That the Pope Ordained only some Italian Bishops near *Rome*; for otherwise when so many Bishops were Martyred, there must have been far more Ordained for the World in that space of time.

*Hyginus*, the next Pope, began (saith *Eusebius*) in the first year of *Antoninus*; but *Binius* saith, he was made Pope the Fifteenth of that Emperor; the Reader will guess whether is to be trusted: The *Pontifical* could find this Pope nothing to do, but to distribute the Orders of

## Part I. *Roman Forgeries in the Councils.*

31

of the Clergy, which Pope *Clement* (according to him) had done long before (*b*).

(h) *Lab.* p. 565.  
*Bin.* pag. 65.  
col. 2.

§. 2. From the Notes on Pope *Pius* Life (*i*), we may observe there was no great care of old taken about the Pope's Succession: For *Optatus*, *S. Augustine*, and *S. Hierom*, with the Old *Pontifical* (before it was altered (*k*)), place *Anicetus* before *Pius*, but the Greeks place *Pius* before *Anicetus*; and in this *Binius* thinks we are to believe them rather than the Latins. The rest of the Notes are spent in vindicating an improbable Story, of an Angel bringing a Decree about *Easter* to *Hermes* the Popes Brother, who writ a Book about keeping it on the Lord's Day; yet after all there is a Book of *Hermes* now extant that hath nothing in it about *Easter*; and there was a Book of old writ by *Hermes*, well known to the Greeks, and almost unknown to the Latins (though writ by a Pope's Brother) read in the Eastern Churches, and counted Apocryphal in the Western: But we want another Angel to come and tell us, whether that now extant be the same or no, for *Binius* cannot resolve us, and only shews his Folly in defending the absurd and incongruous Tales of the *Pontifical*.

(i) *Lab.* p. 568.  
*Bin.* pag. 67.  
col. 2.  
(k) *Cestriens.*  
diff. 2. cap. 11.  
pag. 65.

*Anicetus* either lived before or after *Pius*, and the *Pontifical* makes him very bulie in Shaving his Priests Crowns, never mentioning what he did to suppress those many Heretics who came to *Rome* in his time; but it tells us, he was Buried in the Cœmety of *Calistus* (*l*), though *Calistus* (who gave that Burial-place a name) did not dye till Fifty years after *Anicetus*. But *Binius* (who is loath to own this gross Fallhood) saith, *You are to understand it in that ground which Calistus made a Burying-place afterward*; yet it unluckily falls out, that *Anicetus*'s Successor

(l) *Lab.* p. 579.  
*Bin.* pag. 72.  
col. 1.

Pope *Soter* was also Buried (according to the *Pontifical*) in *Calistus* his Cœmety; and afterwards Pope *Zepherinus*'s Burial-place is described to be not far from that of *Calistus*, so well was *Calistus*'s Cœmety known, even

even before it was made a Cœmetery, and before he was Pope.

(m) *Usserii* Antiq. Brit. cap. 4, 5, &c. & ap. *Spelman*. Tom. I. Concil.

*Eleutherius* succeeded *Soter*, and as the *Pontifical* saith, he received a Letter from *Lucius* King of *Britain*, that he might be made a Christian by his Command; which hint probably first produced those two Epistles between this Pope and King *Lucius* (m), which *Binius* leaves out, though he justifies the Story, of which it were well we had better Evidence than the *Pontifical*. This is certain, the Epistles were forged in an Age when Men could write neither good Latin, nor good Sense; and I am apt to fancy, if *Isidore* had put them into a *Decretal*, they would have been somewhat more polite; so that it is likely these Epistles were made by some Monks, who thought it much for our Honour, to have our Christianity from *Rome*.

(n) *Euseb.* hist. lib. 5. cap. 23, 24, &c.

§. 3. This Century concludes with the bold Pope *Victor*, of whose excommunicating the Eastern Bishops (for not agreeing with him about *Easter*) we have a large account in *Eusebius* (n); but of that there is nothing in the *Pontifical*; only we are told he had a Council at *Rome*, to which he called *Theophilus* (Bishop of *Alexandria*) and decreed *Easter* should be observed upon a Sunday, &c. Upon this hint, and the Authority of a better Author, we grant there were at these times divers Councils held about keeping *Easter*: But the Editors of the Councils (though *Eusebius* be the only credible Author which gives an Account of them) presume to contradict him. For *Eusebius* makes the Council at *Cæsarea* in *Palestina* to be first, and makes *Theophilus* of that City, and *Narcissus* of *Jerusalem*, Presidents of it; but the Editors (for the honour of the Pope) place the Roman Council first (o), and upon the bare Credit of the *Pontifical* (who mistook *Alexandria* for *Cæsarea*) say, That *Theophilus* was present at it; whereas *Eusebius* saith, This Roman Council was the Second called about this Question, consisting of the Bishops about *Rome*. Secondly, The Editors place the Council

(o) *Lab.* p. 596. *Bin.* pag. 79. col. 1, 2. Vid. *Euseb.* lib. 5. cap. 22.

Council of *Cæsarea*, affirming out of a suspicious Fragment of *Bede* (who lived many Centuries after,) *That it was Called by Victor's Authority*; whereas *Eusebius* (as we see) assigns other Presidents to that Council; yea, they intitle all the other Councils about this Matter, *Under Victor*; though in *Eusebius* they are set down as independent upon one another, The Bishops of each Country Calling them by their own Authority. And though *Binius's* Notes (p) brag of *Apostolical and Universal Tradition*; The Bishops of *Asia* produced a contrary Tradition, and called it *Apostolical*, for keeping *Easter* at a different time; which shews how uncertain a ground Tradition is for Articles of Faith, when it varied so much in delivering down a practical Rite through little more than one Century: And the *Asian* Bishops persisting in their Custom, and despising *Victor's* Excommunication, proves, They knew nothing of his Supremacy or Infallibility in those days. We grant *Victor* was in the right as to the time of *Easter*, and that which he and other Councils now agreed on, was agreed upon also at the Council of *Nice*; but *Binius* stretches it too far when he pretends, That general Council confirmed *Victor's* Sentence of Excommunication: For *Victor's* Authority is never urged in the *Nicene* Council, nor his Excommunication mentioned; and we know from *Eusebius*, That the Bishops of his own Opinion severely reprov'd him for offering to pass so rash a Sentence, and to impose his Sense upon remote Churches: So that thus far there is no genuine Proof of any Supremacy exercised or claimed by the Roman Church; for the *Decretals*, which only pretend to make it out, are notorious Forgeries.

(p) *Lab. p. 598.*  
*Bin. pag. 80.*  
*col. i.*

## C H A P. III.

*Of the Forgeries in the Third Century.*

An.Dom.203. §.1. **T**His Century begins with the Life of Pope Zepherine, who Sat Eight years, saith the *Pontifical*; but the Notes tell you, He Sat Eighteen, which is a small Error in that fabulous Author: Yet the Editors believe upon his Credit, that this Pope ordered Vessels of Glas to be used in the Mass (q); and the Notes prove it by Pope Gregory the Great, who lived Four hundred years after this time. However, if we allow the Matter of Fact upon the Testimonies of S. Hierom and Epiphanius; it will follow, That in those Ages (when they used Glas Cups) they did not believe Transubstantiation; for if they had, they would not have ventured Christs Blood in so brittle a Vessel, but have forbid the use of Glasses, as they have done in the Roman Church since this Opinion came in among them (r).

(q) *Lab.* p.603.  
*Bin.* pag.81.  
 col.1.  
 (r) *Dailé de*  
*cult.relig.ap.*  
*Latin.* lib. 2.  
 cap.22.

Under this Pope the Editors place an *African* Council, and say it was Reprobated; yet they cannot make it appear, that this Pope so much as knew of it. Nor was his Advice or Consent at all desired in that case, which was never disputed at Rome till Pope Stephen's time (as themselves confess) viz. Fifty years after this Council was held; from whence we learn, That every Province in this Age believed they had sufficient Authority to determine Controversies in Religion among themselves, without the Consent of the Bishop of Rome.

§.2. Though



§. 2. Though the *Pontifical* be guilty of many Errors in the Life of *Calixtus*, and mistake the very Emperors under which he lived and died, the Notes gloss them all fairly over (s), and correct them by the *Roman Martyrology*, which often follows the *Pontifical*, and is as fabulous as that: However we are told, That *Calixtus* was buried Three Miles out of the City; because the Law of the Twelve Tables forbid *the Burying of a dead Body within the Walls*. Now I would know, if this Law were in force, how that can be true which the *Pontifical* and the Notes affirm and justify, That *S. Peter, Linus, Cletus, Euaristus, Sixtus, Telesphorus, Hyginus, Pius*, and *Victor*, were All Buried in the *Vatican*? And what shall we think of the Miracles done by their Relicks and at their Tombs, if no Body know where they were first Buried?

(s) *Lab.* p. 608.  
*Bin.* pag. 83.  
col. i.

Pope *Urban*, the Successor of *Calixtus*, is said in the *Pontifical* (t), to be Buried in the Cœmety of *Prætextatus*, which could not then be any Cœmety at all, because *Prætextatus* was not Martyred till the Persecution under *Maximinus*, which hapned many years after: And if the Story of *S. Cecily* in the same Author, be no Truer than his Chronology, the Romanists worship a fictitious Saint.

(t) *Lab.* p. 517.  
*Bin.* pag. 87.  
col. i.

The *Pontifical* is forced to feign, That the Emperor *Alexander Severus* was a Persecutor, contrary to his Character in all Histories of Credit; and this only to make us think, that *Calixtus, Urban*, and Pope *Pontianus* his Successor, were Martyrs. However though *Eusebius*, knew not of their Martyrdom (u), the Roman Church adores them all as Martyrs, and have peculiar Days dedicated to their Memories.

(u) *Euseb. hist.*  
lib. 6. cap. 15,  
17, & 22.

*Antherus* (as the *Pontifical* says) Sat Twelve years and One Month; and the Notes say, *that he Sat only one Month* (w); so that there is but only Twelve years mistaken in this Popes Life: And if he was Pope but one Month, doubtless his Secretaries had need be very swift Writers, or else they could not gather many in

(w) *Lab.* p. 629.  
*Bin.* pag. 92.  
col. i.

his time. However *Binius* will make it out, for he brings in a Poetical Hyperbole, *Of those Scribes, who could write a Sentence before a man had spoken it; and so were as quick at guessing as writing*; and applies this in very serious earnest to this Pope's Notaries, to make us imagine, there were many Acts of Martyrs writ out in this short-lived Pope's time.

(x) *Lab. p. 638.*  
*Bin. pag. 95.*  
 col. 2.

(y) *Lab. p. 650.*  
*Bin. pag. 101.*  
 col. 2.

§. 3. Pope *Fabian*, as *Eusebius* relates, was chosen by occasion of a Dove's lighting on his Head, when the People were met to elect a Pope; of which remarkable Story the fabulous *Pontifical* takes no notice, but tells us, *That in this Popes time Novatus the Heretic came to Rome*(x); that is, say the Notes, *Above a year after Pope Fabian was dead, after the Vacancy, and in Pope Cornelius's time*; with such absurd Comments do these Gentlemen delight to cover the Ignorance and Falshood of their Historian; but such Excuses do only more expose him. In this Pope's time were two Councils held, one in *Africa*, the other in *Arabia*, and they Intitle them both *under Fabian*; yet the only Authors, who mention these Councils, do not say Pope *Fabian* was concerned in either of them (y), and therefore they were not *under Fabian*.

After this Pope's death there was a Vacancy of more than one whole year, which the Editors, to flatter the Papacy, call (in the style of Princes) *An Interregnum*; but alas! their admired Monarchy, was now turned into an Aristocracy, and the Clergy governed the Roman Church; to excuse which flaw in their visible Monarchical Succession, the Notes say, *The Members next the Head knew it was their parts, to do the office of the Head*: Which notable kind of substitution, if it could be made out in the Body Natural, Beheading would not be a Mortal punishment; however, they must say something to make us believe there was always a Visible Head of the Catholic Church, or at least a Neck and Shoulders, which stood for an Head, till *Cornelius* was chosen Pope: *And they called a Council* (as they pretend)

pretend) in this Vacancy, and writ a Letter of their Determination to all the Churches in the World, that they might all observe what the Empty Chair of Peter had ordered (z). But if any one read the Letter it self, it will appear that this Council was only a voluntary Assembly of the Clergy in Rome, and they met only to confirm S. Cyprian's Opinion, and only writ their Letter to him; but never pretended either to be Judges over Cyprian, or any other part of the Catholic Church.

Pope Cornelius his Life follows, for whose Character we are more obliged to S. Cyprian's Epistles, than to the Pontifical, which invents an idle Story of a Dialogue between Cornelius and Decius the Emperor; and though the Notes own (a), That Decius (who is here pretended to Martyr him) dyed the same Month in which Cornelius entred; yet they will not own the Story to be false, but boldly put in the Name of Volusianus into their Margin instead of Decius. However, the Breviary (b) retains the Fiction of Cornelius suffering under Decius, as it doth also the Fable of his Translating the Bodies of S. Peter and S. Paul: But let any considering Man compare the different ways of telling this Sham Story, and he will easily discern, that the Notes cannot reconcile them without flying to a Miracle (c). It is evident they have told us, the Body of S. Peter was in the Vatican, when Pope Victor was there Buried, An. 203: And there is no Author of Credit mentions their removal into the Catacumba, and so consequently no reason to believe they were fetcht back from thence in a time of Persecution. Pope Gregory lived 350 years after this, and was very apt to credit feigned Miracles, and he differs much from the Pontifical; so that probably the whole Story is forged, by those who long after began superstitiously to adore the Relicks of Saints. However, it is read in the Roman Church Septemb. 16. and many devout People on the Credit of this Legend make Pilgrimages, and offer Prayers and large Gifts, to the Shrines of these

(a) Lab. p. 665  
Bin. pag. 108.  
col. 1.

(b) Breviar.  
Sixt. 5. 16 die  
Septemb.

(c) Lab. p. 567.  
Bin. pag. 108.  
col. 1.

two Apostles, of whose true Relicks they can have none, because their real Graves are not known.

(d) Lab. p. 714.  
Bin. pag. 126.  
col. 1.

In this Pope's time there were two Councils holden at Carthage, two at Rome, and one in Italy; all which in the general Titles are said to be held under Cornelius (d); though the Notes assure us, That those two at Carthage were called by S. Cyprian's Authority, and that the Italian Bishops made a Decree of their own, besides that of Cornelius at Rome. The Roman Councils indeed were holden under Cornelius, as being Bishop of that City; but we may observe, He did not Authoritatively confirm the Sentence of the Council of Carthage, but only consented to it. We may also Note, This African Council calls not Pope Cornelius Father, but Brother, and writes to him as one of their Collegues; yea, they do not except Cornelius, when they Decree, That if any of their Collegues agreed not to their Sentence, he should answer it at the Day of Judgment (e). Moreover, in the same Letter there is an evident Testimony, that the People in those days were prepared for Martyrdom, by receiving the Eucharistical Cup (f); which being now denied to the Laity, the Editors pass it by without a Note; yet soon after, where the Council plainly speaks of Confessing the Name of Christ before Persecutors; they have this impertinent Marginal Note, From this and other places, the necessity of Confession is confirmed: As if this belonged to their new invented Auricular Confession.

(e) Lab. p. 718.  
Bin. pag. 128.  
col. 1.  
(f) Lab. p. 717.  
Bin. pag. 127.  
col. 2.

(g) Lab. p. 720.  
Bin. pag. 128.  
col. 2.

§. 4. The Notes find divers Faults in the Life of Pope Lucius, yet they would palliate the grossest of all; for the Pontifical says, He was Beheaded by Valerian; the Notes affirm it was by Gallus and Volusianus; and yet the same Notes tell us, The Pontifical (in saying it was by Valerian) may be very well and truly expounded (g). The Reader must understand, It may be so expounded by such kind of Notes, as are designed to make gross Errors seem great Truths.

Pope *Stephen*, who succeeded *Lucius*, fell out with *Cyprian* and the *African* Bishops, about the re-baptizing of Heretics, which (though it were the only memorable thing in this Popes Life) the *Pontifical* never mentions: And the Editors are so used to put into the Title of all Councils, *Under such or such a Pope*, that in this Popes time they style those very Councils, *Sub Stephano*, which were called without his knowledge, and which condemned his Opinion (h), as may be seen in the Councils of *Carthage*, *Iconium*, and *Africa*, where (so easily may Tradition be mistaken) the Re-baptizing of Heretics is asserted to be an *Apostolick Tradition*, though it were contrary to Pope *Stephen's* Opinion, and the Tradition of the *Roman Church*. And when *Stephen* on this account presumed to Excommunicate the *Asian* Bishops, *Firmilianus* (Bishop of *Cæsarea*) in a Letter to *S. Cyprian* (i), Despises his Sentence, compares the Pope to *Judas*, complains of his Arrogance, and esteems those to be very silly who took the *Roman* Bishop's word for an *Apostolical Tradition*; from which that Church in many Instances had departed. Moreover, He calls him a *Schismatic*, and affirms, *he had by this rash Sentence only cut himself off from the Unity of the Catholic Church*. *S. Cyprian* also, and his *Africans* (k), condemned this Pope as a *Favourer of Heretics*, an *Enemy to the Church*, and one who writ *Contradictions*, and was void of *Prudence*; describing him as an *Innovator and bringer in of Traditions*, contrary to *God's Word*, as one who obstinately presumed to prefer *human Doctrines* before *Scripture*. I grant Pope *Stephen* was in the right in this Controversie; yet doubtless, if these Bishops had believed the *Supremacy*, and *Infallibility* of the Pope and his *Roman Council*, they could not have used him at this rate: And the Editors are so concerned to cover this rough usage, that they reprint an Epistle of *S. Cyprian's* Verbatim (l), after this Quarrel was grown hot, which was writ while they two were Friends, and contains very kind Words to *Stephen*; which Blind is only to make us think

(h) *Lab.* p. 751.  
pag. 760. &c.  
*Bin.* pag. 137.  
141, 145. &c.

(i) *Lab.* p. 751.  
*Bin.* pag. 141.  
col. 2.

(k) *Lab.* p. 765.  
*Bin.* pag. 147.  
col. 2.

(l) *Lab.* p. 740.  
& pag. 764.  
*Bin.* pag. 136.  
col. 2. & p. 146.  
col. 2.

think that *Cyprian* submitted to the Pope at last, though it is apparent he never did so: Again, the Reader may note that *Labbe* here prints a Tract of some Ancient Author, to justify the Pope's Opinion; but though there be many good Arguments for it from other Topics, the Argument from Tradition, and the determination of the Roman Church, is not urged in the whole Discourse (*m*), which shews that these were no Arguments allowed in this Writers time: Lastly whereas the third Council of *Carthage*, severely censures Pope *Stephen* for taking upon him as Bishop of Bishops, and for compelling his Equals by Tyrannical Terrors to obey him (*n*): *Binius* impudently notes upon this, that the Pope was called Bishop of Bishops, to him was the last Refuge in Matters of Faith, and his Determinations were received all the World over as the Oracles of the Holy Ghost: Which is from his Usurping a Title and Authority, to infer he had Right to them; and to prove that all the World received his Determinations, from a Story which shews, that half the Christian World rejected them.

(m) *Lab.* p. 770.

(n) *Lab.* p. 786.

*Bin.* pag. 149.

col. 2. & p. 154.

§. 5. The Life of *Sixtus* the Second, in the *Pontifical* is one heap of Errors, for the Author seems to mistake him for *Xystus* the Philosopher; and as the Notes confess, make *Decius* raise a great Persecution against the Church, Eight year after he was Dead. He also places *Valerian* before *Decius*, supposing them to Reign together, and saying *Sixtus* was Beheaded by *Valerian* in *Decius's* time (*o*); now *Decius* was slain two year before *Valerian* was Emperor: Yet the Notes labour to colour over all these Contradictions, to Salve the Credit of their Missals and Fabulous Martyrology.

(o) *Lab.* p. 819.

*Bin.* pag. 155.

col. 1.

(p) *Lab.* p. 827.

*Bin.* pag. 158.

col. 1.

*Dionysius* the next Pope, is said to have been a Monk, upon the credit of the *Pontifical* (*p*); the Notes add that he Lived a Solitary Life, before his Election; yet the Modern Monks have given over that Primitive Custom, and now croud into great Cities: But the *Pontifical* is so miserably mistaken in the Consuls in this Popes Life, placing those for his last Consuls who were so, two years before



## Part I. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

41

before those he Names for his first Consuls, that nothing can be believed on this Authors credit. Under this Pope the Editors have feigned a Council at *Rome*, to which *Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria* was Cited, and so far obeyed the Order, as to write an Epistle to clear himself, for which they cite *Athanasius* (q): But we must never trust their Quotations where the Supremacy is concerned, without looking into the Authors they cite: (q) *Lab. p. 8; o. Bin. pag. 160. col. 1.*

And *Athanasius* only saith *Dionysius* of *Alexandria* was accused at *Rome*, and writ to the Pope to know the Articles complained of, who sent him an Account, upon which he vindicated himself by an Apology: But what is all this to a Roman Council, or a citing *Dionysius* thither? There were also two Councils at *Antioch*, about this time as *Eusebius* tells us (r); But the Editors of their own Head put in that the first of them, was appointed by *Dionysius* Bishop of *Rome*, to whom the chief care of the Church was committed—Whereas *Eusebius* never mentions this Pope as being either concerned in the Council, or consulted about it: but if they will have it under *Dionysius*, then we may infer, that this Pope approved a saying of this Council, viz. That they knew of no other Mediator between God and Man but only Christ Jesus. The Second Council of *Antioch* is intitled also, Under Pope *Dionysius*: Yet it appears by *Eusebius* (s), that this Pope knew not of the Council, till they by their Synodical Epistle informed him of it after they were risen: And in that Epistle they joyn him, and *Maximus* Bishop of *Alexandria* together as Collegues and equals, not desiring either of them to confirm their Decrees; but acquainting them with their proceedings, they required them to shew their consent by writing Communicatory Letters to *Domnus*, who was put in by them, Bishop of *Antioch*, in the Room of *Paulus Samosatenus*; ejected for Heresie; and though this *Domnus* his Father, *Demetrianus* had been Bishop of *Antioch* before, yet we hear of no Papal Dispensation to allow him to succeed there: We may also observe, that *Firmilianus* (who in Pope *Stephens* time

time so much despised the Popes Authority and Infalibility) is by this Council called a *Man of blessed Memory*: By which we see how little any Ancient and genuine Councils do countenance the Supremacy of the Roman Church, and what need they had to forge Evidence, who would have it taken for a Primitive Doctrine.

§. 6. That *Felix* the First was a Martyr, is proved only by the *Pontifical*, and the Roman Martyrology which often blindly follows it; but why may not the *Pontifical* be mistaken in the Martyrdom, as well as the Notes confess it to be in the Consuls (r)? And the base Partiality of the Notes appears soon after in citing a place of S. Cyprian; as if he desired to know the Days on which the Martyrs suffered, that he might offer a Sacrifice for them by Names on their Anniversaries (u); whereas Cyprian speaks of the Confessors who died privately in Prisons, of whose Names he desires to be informed, that he might celebrate their Memory among the Martyrs: Now there is a great difference between S. Cyprian's and the Protestants practice, to Commemorate the Saints departed; and the Roman way, of offering the Sacrifice of the Mass for the deceased: Yet the Notes would suborn S. Cyprian to give in evidence for this corrupt practice.

Pope Eutychianus lived not long before Eusebius's time, and he saith he only sat ten Months (w); The *Pontifical* allows him thirteen Months, but the Notes boldly say he was Pope Eight years (x), and this only upon the Names of two Consuls set down in the *Pontifical*, and the credit of the Roman Martyrology; but since these two are scarce ever right in their Chronology, we ought to believe Eusebius rather than the Annotator and his despicable Witnesses.

His Successor Gaius lived in Eusebius's own time, and he affirms he sat Fifteen years (y); but the *Pontifical* allots to him Eleven years only, and so doth the Breviary (z); both of them making him Dioclesian's Kinsman, (which Eusebius knew nothing of; ) The Notes out of Baronius contradict them all, and ascribe to him Twelve years, mak-

(t) Lab. p. 903.  
Bin. pag. 163.  
col. 1.

(u) Cypr. lib. 3.  
ep. 6. vel epist.  
37. pag. 81.  
vid. Dailè de  
cult. relig. Lar.  
lib. 3. cap. 3.  
pag. 352.

(w) Euseb. hist.  
lib. 7. cap. 26.

(x) Lab. p. 913.  
Bin. pag. 167.  
col. 2.

(y) Euseb. hist.  
lib. 7. cap. 26.

(z) Brev. Roman.  
April. 22.

## Part I. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

43

making him *Dioclesian's* Nephew; and yet the *Pontifical* saith both that he fled from *Dioclesian's* Persecution, and died a Confessor. Yet was Crowned with Martyrdom with his Brother *Gabinus*; which Non-sense *Baronius* and the Notes also defend.

§. 7. This Century is concluded by the Unfortunate *Marcellinus*, who as the *Pontifical* tells us, *did Sacrifice to Idols* (a); and *S. Augustine* in the Notes plainly supposes (a) *Lab. p. 930. Bin. pag. 174. col. 2.* it to be true: Yet the Annotator (who dares not deny it) labours to Amuse the Reader by saying, *this Story may be plainly refuted and proved false by divers probable Reasons out of Baronius*; but because their Missals and Martyrology do own the thing, he will not go that way to Work: What then? Doth he clearly charge the Infallible Judge with Apostacy? No, he saith, *He seemed to deny the Faith by External acts, (that is, Sacrificing to Idols; ) Yet by his Internal acts, (it seems Binus knew his thoughts) he did not believe any thing contrary to the Faith*: And truly this is an early Instance of Jesuitical Equivocation: But we may make the same Excuse for all the Apostates in the World; and it is plain the Notes care not what they say, to protect their dear Infallibility against the most convincing Truths.

About the very time of this Pope's Apostacy was held a Council at *Cirta* in *Africk*; and though *S. Augustine*, the Author from whom they have all they know about it, say not one Word of *Marcellinus*, Yet the Editors and Annotator both, put in these Words, that it was under *Marcellinus* (b); Where I cannot but wonder, (b) *Lab. p. 936. Bin. pag. 177. col. 1, 2.* that (since they have invented a Council in the same year to set poor *Marcellinus* Right again, after his Apostacy;) they did not place that Council first, and then their reconciled Penitent might with a better Grace, have sat at *Cirta* and Condemned such as fell in the Persecution.

But the most Infamous Forgery, is the Ridiculous Council of *Sinuessa* (c), devised by some dull Monk, who (c) *Lab. p. 938. Bin. pag. 178.* could write neither good Sense nor true Latin, inspired only by a blind Zeal for the Roman Church, whose

Infallible Head must be cleared from Apostacy; though it be by the absurdest Fictions imaginable: For he feigns this Apostate Pope met Three-hundred Bishops near *Sinuessa*, in *Dioclesian's* time in a Cave, which would hold but Fifty of them at once, and their business was only to hear *Marcellinus* condemn himself, and to tell him he could be Judged by none. The two first Copies of this Council were so stuffed with Barbarisms, false Latin and Nonsense, and so contrary to each other, that some Body took Pains out of both to devise a third Copy, and by changing and adding at pleasure, brought it at last to some tolerable Sense: *Survius* and *Binius* print all three Copies, but *Labbe* and the *Collectio regia* leave out the two Originals, and only publish the Third, dressed up by a late Hand, which in time may pass for the true account of this Council. But the two first Copies in *Binius*, yet extant, will give the Reader a good proof into what depths of Ignorance the Monks were fallen, when such Unintelligible and Incoherent stuff as this, and the Letters Forged between the Council of *Nice* and Pope *Sylvester*, (which are in the same Style,) were designed to support the Roman Supremacy and Infallibility. I shall not reflect upon the Absurdity, of making the Pope his own Judge, when he denies the Fact, nor the Contradiction of the Councils, saying often *They must not judge him*; and yet declaring soon after *That they have Condemned him* (d):

Whoever will but read this Council over, shall find diversion enough, if Blunders and Dulness be diverting to them. I shall therefore principally note the gross Partiality and Fallacies of the Notes, in colouring over this bare-faced Forgery: First, the Annotator accuses the Century Writers, and English Innovators for rejecting this Rare Council as a Forgery of the *Donatists*, he should have said of the *Romish Monks*; yet he makes more Objections against it, than he himself can answer: Protestants wonder that Three-hundred Bishops should dare to meet in times of Persecution: He replies, a far less number did meet on a slihter occasion Fifty years

(d) *Bin. p. 179.*  
 180, & 183.

years before, which is but a very indifferent Proof; Well, but to magnify the occasion, he saith, *By this Pope's fall, not only the Roman Church, but the whole Christian Religion was in extreme danger; and in the President of the Catholic Faith, the very Foundation of the Church was shaken and almost ruined*: Yet a little before he had told us out of *S. Augustine*, that *Marcellinus's* fall did no prejudice to the Church, and had affirmed *that the ill Deeds of Bishops may hurt themselves, but cannot prejudice the Churches Orthodox Doctrine* (e): Again, he proves it could not be an Invention of the *Donatists*, because they never knew of it; yet presently he owns they objected it to the Catholics, and therefore must know of it, all that *S. Augustine* saith, being only *that they could not prove it*: After this *Baronius* and he say, *that no Writer doth mention this City of Sinuessæ, nor is there any Memory of such a place or Cave*: Which is a great mistake in them both. For *Livy*, *Cicero*, *Ovid*, *Martial* and *Pliny*, do all speak of *Sinuessæ* (f), and *Alexander ab Alexandro*, mentions a famous High-way, leading from Rome to this City (g). And if an Earthquake have since Overthrown it, that will not prove there was no such City then: all the Wonder is that these Gentlemen should defend a Council for genuine, which they thought had been held in *Utopia*: The Notes proceed to tell us that *Very many most Learned Men*, (not *Hereticks*, I suppose) by *very strong Arguments* have laboured to prove these *Acts* *spurious*: But he (who values no Arguments against the Supremacy,) *not only thinks them not to be false, but judges them worthy of great Esteem for their Venerable Antiquity, and for their Majesty which extorts Reverence even from the unwilling*: Now their *Antiquity* cannot be proved by one Old Author, and their *Majesty* is so little, that they extort Laughter and Contempt from the gravest Reader: Let us therefore hear his Reason for this Approbation, it is *because they are believed by general consent of all*; (He forgets that he said but now, very many and very Learned Men did not believe them;) *And because they are received and retained without*

(e) *Bin.* p. 175.  
col. 1. 2.

(f) *Peranij*  
*Lexic. Geo-*  
*graph.* p. 199.  
(g) *Al. ab. Al-*  
*exand. gen. dier.*  
lib. 3. cap. 13.



(h) Brev. Roman. April. 26.

*without any Controversy to this Day, in the Martyrologies and Breviaries of the Roman and other Churches (h) : So that at last, all the Authority for this Council is the Roman Martyrology and Breviary; which are Modern Collections, out of the Fabulous Pontifical and other Forged Acts of Martyrs; And though their own Learned Men by good Arguments prove the things to be false, yet if they be Read in a Breviary, &c. these Falshoods become true, and Catholics receive them without Controversy : Yea, they cite the Transcript of a Forgery to prove the Original to be a Truth. Again, the Notes say it is no prejudice to the Truth of Marcellinus his fall, though the Africans did not know of it, nor S. Augustine, no nor any of the African Church : Yet in the next Page it is observed, That there are very many Names of the Witnesses which prove his fall, which are peculiar to the African Christians : Now if these Names were peculiar to the Africans, then these Witnesses were of the African Church Originally, and then it is Morally impossible, that they should never tell none of their Countrymen, of so Famous a Transaction : The Notes confess that these Acts often mention *Libra occidua* ; which is a Word invented after the Empire was divided into East and West : And thence the same Notes infer, these Acts were not writ in those Ancient times; yet they make it a wonder, that they were not seen in Africa in S. Augustine's time or before : Which is to wonder that they had not seen them in Africa, before they were written : It puzzles the Annotator to make out an excuse for that ridiculous Falshood in these Acts, that Marcellinus was led into the Temple of Vesta, and Isis, and there Sacrificed to Hercules, Jupiter and Saturn ; because these Gods were never placed, nor Worshiped in the Temples of those female Deities : Nor can he allow what the Acts say about this Council, being held when Dioclesian was in his Persian War; for he affirms it was held Two years after that War, when Dioclesian had devested himself of the Empire, and lived a private Life ; But then the Acts make Dioclesian to be present, and in Rome when Marcellinus did Sacrifice ;*

*Comp. Brev. Roman. April. 26.  
R. Lib. 1. H. 1. Postest.  
B. 1. d. 2. 27.*



fice; and at this rate the Pope would have laied two years at least in his Apostacy, which the Annotator must not endure. To conclude, we now see, *That a Council held no body knows where nor when, concealed from all Ancient Authors, writ in later times, full of Barbarisms, and Non-sense, Falshoods and contradictions,* if it do but pretend to make out the Supremacy and Infallibity of the Pope, and set him (while he was an Apostate and falsely denied the Fact,) above a Council of Three hundred Innocent Bishops; if it do but say the Pope, though never so wicked, cannot be judged by any but himself: This Council shall be published by the Roman Editors, and vindicated by partial Notes, as if it were a most genuine and Authentic Truth: From whence it is plain, That these Editors, and especially this Annotator hath no other measure of Truth and Fals-hood, but the Interest of the Roman Church, which they resolve to promote, though it be by the most unjust means. And this may suffice to observe for the Third Century.

THE JOURNAL OF THE

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

FOR THE YEAR 1900

CHICAGO, ILL., 1901

Published by the American Medical Association

535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 2, 1896

Postpaid by the Postoffice at Chicago, Ill.,

May 2, 1896, under Postoffice No. 100,000

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of

postage provided for in Act of October 3,

1917, authorized on July 10, 1918

Postage paid by addressee

Subscription price, \$5.00 per annum in

advance

Single copies, 15 cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 2, 1896

Postpaid by the Postoffice at Chicago, Ill.,

May 2, 1896, under Postoffice No. 100,000

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of

postage provided for in Act of October 3,

1917, authorized on July 10, 1918

Postage paid by addressee

---

A  
BRIEF ACCOUNT  
OF THE  
**Roman Forgeries,**  
IN THE  
VOLUMES  
OF THE  
**COUNCILS,**  
For the Fourth Century.

---

PART II.

---

CHAPTER IV.

*Of the Forgeries in the Fourth Century.*

§. I. **T**His Century begins with the Life of *Mar-* An. Dom. 304.  
*cellus*, a Pope so obscure, that *Eusebius's* (a) *Lab. Tom. III.*  
 Chronicle wholly omits him (a); and pag. 947.  
*Theodoret* knew nothing of him, nor of Pope *Eusebius*, Bin. Tom. I.  
 but makes *Melchiades* immediate Successor to *Mar-* pag. 185. col. 2.  
 cellinus

(b) *Theod. hist.*  
lib. 1 cap. 3.

(c) *Richer. de*  
*Eccles. potestate*  
cap. 3. pag. 46.

*cellinus* (b). It is very observable, that these two unknown Popes, in the Notes on their Lives, are said to have sat Seven years between them : And the Pontifical saith, There was a Vacancy of Seven years after *Marcellinus*, which Vacancy is also asserted by *Anastasius Biblioth.* by *Luitprandus*, *Abbo Floriacens.* *Cusanus*, and *Genebrard* (c). And though *Baronius's* and *Binius's* Notes, deny this Seven years Vacancy, it is upon meer Conjecture : The Scandal of so long a Vacancy no doubt, setting some of the old Parasites of Rome on work, to invent two Popes Names and put them into the List, from whence probably they have been foisted into *Optatus* and *S. Augustine*, two Latin Fathers, while the Greek Authors (which these Forgers Understood not) do continue Uncorrupted : And truly nothing but the Names of these two Popes remain; for no good Historian mentions any one Eminent Act done by either of them; however, the Annotator had rather fill up his Scene with empty Names of Feigned Popes, who did nothing for Seven years together, than let the Reader suppose the Catholic Church could so long want its pretended Head. But though the Notes allow not the Authority of the Pontifical for the Vacancy, they trust it for the fictitious Story of this *Marcellus* his Life, and would have us believe, That in a time of Persecution this Pope appointed Twenty five Churches in Rome, to Baptize Converts and Bury Martyrs in; and though the Laws and Customs of that City then, forbid to Bury dead Bodies within the Walls, we are to believe that the Tyrant *Maxentius* (who made all these Martyrs, and persecuted this very Pope) consented to his breaking this Ancient Law. On the Credit of the same Pontifical we are told, That a certain Lady, called *Lucina*, dedicated her House to this Pope (while He was alive) by the Title of *S. Marcellus*; and that the Emperor turned it into a Stable, and made the Pope his Beast-keeper there, where Naked, and cloathed with Sackcloth, (they are the Words of the Pontifical) He soon after

## Part II. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

51

after ended his days, the 17<sup>th</sup> of the *Kalends* of *February* (d). Which Fiction the *Roman Breviary* orders to be read to the Credulous People of that Communion for Lessons; and tells them, That *Marcellus* writ an Epistle to the Bishops of the *Antiochian* Province about the *Roman Primacy*, and to prove *Rome* to be the Head of All Churches, and that no Synod should be held without the Pope's Authority. But this Epistle (e) is owned by *Labbé* to be a Forgery, patched up out of divers Modern Authors, citing the Vulgar Latin Version, and dated after *Marcellus* his death: And it is very strange, That times of Persecution should be a proper Season for a Pope to wrangle for his Supremacy: Yet this Notorious Forgery saith, *Christ ordered S. Peter, to Translate his Seat from Antioch to Rome; and that the Apostles by Inspiration decreed, That all Appeals should be made thither, and no Council held, but by the Authority of the Roman Church.* For which cause *Binius* vindicates it with Notes as full of Falseness as the Epistle it self (f): His first Note of this Epistle being writ to one *Solomon* a Bishop, is an oversight, and belongs to the first Epistle of Pope *Marcellinus* (g). His next Notes about the Primacy and Power of Calling Synods, cite an Apostolical and *Nicene* Canon for it; but no such Canons are to be found. He quotes also two Epistles, one writ to Pope *Felix* from *Alexandria*; another writ by Pope *Julius*, to the Eastern Churches, for proof of this Supremacy; and the same Annotator afterwards owns them both to be Forgeries (h). He falsely saith, *Dioscorus* was Condemned at *Chalcedon*, only for holding a Synod without the Pope's Consent; whereas he is known to have been accused of many other Crimes. His Text of *Pasce oves*, is nothing to this purpose; nor will Pope *Pelagius* his Word be taken in his own Cause. His Story of *Valentinian* makes nothing for the Pope, more than any other Bishop; Yea, the Bishops desiring him to call a Council, shews, They thought it was His Prerogative; and *Nicephorus* relates his Answer to have

(d) *Breviar.*  
*Rom. Jan. 16.*  
pag. 674.

(e) *Lab. p. 942.*  
*Bin. pag. 186.*  
col. 1.

(f) *Lab. p. 950.*  
*Bin. pag. 187.*  
col. 1.

(g) *Bin. p. 175.*  
col. 2.  
*Baron. An. 296.*  
§. 45.

(h) *Bin. Not. in*  
*Epist. Fel. p. 499*  
& *Not. in Ep.*  
*Julii, pag. 385.*

been, *That he was so taken up with State Affairs, that he had no leisure to enquire into those matters* (i): Wherefore after all this elaborate Sophistry, to justify a false Assertion of a Forged Epistle, the Annotator hath only shewed his partiality for the Pope's Power, but made no proof of it.

The second Epistle of this *Marcellus* (to the Tyrant *Maxentius*) is also a manifest Forgery (k); part of it is taken out of his Successor *Gregory's* Epistles, writ almost Three hundred years after this; and it is highly improbable, That a persecuted Pope should falsely, as well as ridiculously, to a Pagan Emperor, quote *the Laws of the Apostles, and their Successors, forbidding to persecute the Church and Clergy*; and also instruct him about the Roman Churches power in Calling Synods, and Receiving Appeals; and cite *Clement's* Forged Epistle as an Authority to *Maxentius*, That Lay-men must not accuse Bishops. The Notes indeed are unwilling to lose such precious Evidence, and so pretend, That *Maxentius* at this time dissembled himself, to be a Christian; but this Sham can signify nothing to such as read the Epistle, where *Marcellus* complains, That he then persecuted him most unjustly, and therefore he did not pretend to be a Christian at that time; and consequently the whole Epistle is an absurd Forgery: And so is that Decree subjoyned to it, which supposes young Children offered to Monasteries, and Shaved or Veiled there; Customs which came up divers Centuries after this.

(i) *Lab. p. 967.*  
*Bin. pag. 189.*  
*col. 1.*

§. 2. The Canons of *Peter*, Bishop of *Alexandria* (l), are genuine, and a better Record of Ecclesiastical Discipline, than any Pope to this time ever made; the Reader also may observe, the Bishop of *Rome* is not once named in these Canons; and they plead Tradition for the *Wednesday* Fast, contrary to the Roman Churches pretence, of having an Apostolical Tradition, to Fast on *Saturday*.



## Part II. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

53

The Council of *Eliberis* in *Spain*, is by *Binius* An.Dom.305. placed under Pope Marcellus; which Words *Labbé* leaves out of the Title (m), and justly; for if there were such a Pope, the Council takes no notice of him, nor is it likely, that *Rome* did know of this Council till many years after. Yet it is both Ancient and Authentic, though *Mendoza* in *Labbé* (n), reckons up divers Catholic Authors, *Caranza*, *Canus*, *Baronius*, &c. who either wholly reject it, or deny the 34th, 35th, 36th, and 40th Canons of it, which condemn the Opinions now held at *Rome*: And though *Binius* (because Pope *Innocent* approves it) dare not reject it; yet he publishes Notes to make the Reader believe, it doth not condemn any of their Opinions or Practices. m) Lab. p. 967. E. Bin. pag. 191. col. 1. (n) Lab. p. 103c.

The 13th Canon speaks of Virgins, who dedicated themselves to God; but mentions not their being Veiled, or Living in Monasteries; which Customs came in long after, as the Authors cited in the Notes shew (o).

The 26th Canon calls it an Error, to Fast upon Saturday: But the Notes are so bold as to say, *The Error which this Council corrected, was the not Fasting on Saturday*; whereas even these very Notes confess, That the Eastern Churches, and most of the Western, (*Rome*, and some few others excepted), together with the African Church, did not Fast on Saturday, but Wednesday; yea, those they Call the Apostolical Canons, and *Clement's* Constitutions, do both establish Wednesday Fast, and condemn their pretended Apostolical Churches Saturday Fast; and if divers in *Spain* (as the Notes say) in *S. Hierom's* and Pope *Innocent's* times, did not Fast on Saturday, and others then needed Arguments to settle them in this Roman practice: It may be gathered from thence, that in the time of this Council, the Saturday Fast was esteemed an Error, as it was also in that Age almost in all Christian Churches, and so the very Words of the Canon import, which *Baronius* saw, and therefore (p) only saith, *There is mention of the Saturday Fast in this* (o) Lab. p. 983. D. Bin. pag. 200. col. 1. (p) Baron. Anal. An. 305.

*Synod*;

*Synod*; and so passes it, knowing it plainly contradicted the Roman Churches Tradition.

The 34<sup>th</sup> Canon (under pain of Excommunication) forbids the lighting Wax Candles in the places where the Martyrs were Buried (*q*); which agrees with the Sentiments of the Primitive Church (*r*). *Lactantius* condemns Lighting Candles in God's Worship by day, as a Paganish Superstition (*s*). *S. Hierom* saith, It was used in his time only by such as did it to humor the silly Vulgar, who had a Zeal without Knowledge (*t*). Yet the Notes confess this is the Custom of the Roman Church; for which only cause some of their Doctors reject this Canon (since nothing must be Authentic, which condemns their Novel Superstitions) and these Notes make a miserable Blunder to excuse the matter; but we are not concerned, whether (with the Annotator) these Candles in the Day-light disturb the Spirits of the Living Saints, by seeing an Heathenish Rite brought into the Church, or (with *Baronius*) displease the Saints Deceased, to behold so Superstitious a thing vainly devised for their honour. Since it sufficiently appears, the practice is novel and absurd, and (though now used at *Rome*) condemned by the best Antiquity. The Notes also give us one extraordinary distinction (*u*), between the Souls of deceased Saints in Heaven, and those in Purgatory; which latter sort, if they had been Saints, one would think should need no such dreadful Scouring.

(p) *Lab.* p. 985. E  
*Bin.* pag. 201.  
col. 1.  
(r) *Dailé de*  
*cultu* Lat. lib. 2.  
chap. 15.  
(s) *Lactant.*  
*Instit.* lib. 6.  
cap. 2.  
(t) *Hieron.* ad  
*Ripar.* ep. 53.

The 36<sup>th</sup> Canon determines, That Pictures ought not to be in Churches, and that none may Paint upon Walls that which is worshiped (*w*): Which so expressly condemns the Roman Worship of Pictures and Images, that the boldest Writers of that Church reject this Canon; but others (as the Notes say) would gladly expound it so, as to assert the honour and worship due to Holy Images; (which is a notable kind of Exposition, to make a Canon assert that, which it confutes:) But such transparent Fallacies deserve rather derision, than serious Arguments. *Sanders* and *Turrian* observe, That these

(u) *Bin.* Not.  
in 34 & 35  
*Can.* p. 201.  
col. 2.  
(w) *Lab.* p. 986.  
*Bin.* pag. 201.  
col. 2.

these Fathers forbid not Images, which Christians might take away and hide; but Pictures, which they must leave exposed to Pagan abuses. But might not this have been prevented, by hanging up their Pictures in Frames? and are not large Images as difficult to be removed and concealed as Pictures? Yea, doth not the present Roman Church adore Pictures as well as Images? so that still this Canon condemns them. *Martinez* fancies, *This Council forbid Painting on the Walls, lest the Pictures should be deformed by the decay of those Walls:* But he forgets, that the Council first forbids them to be any where in the Church; and were not Walls as subject to decay in the time of the Second *Nicene* Council, as they are now? And had not those Fathers as great an honour for Pictures, as these at *Elliberis*? yet the *Nicene* Picture-Worshippers, order them to be painted on Church-Walls. *Martinez* adds, *That as times vary, human Statutes vary; and so the Second Council of Nice made a quite contrary Decree.* What! are Decrees of Councils about Matters of Divine Worship, only human Statutes? what will become of the Divine Authority and Apostolical Tradition, pretended for this Worship of old at *Nice*, and now at *Rome*, if the Orders against it and for it be both human and mutable Statutes? It is well however, that the Patrons of Image-Worship do own, they have altered and abrogated a Primitive Canon, for one made Four hundred years after, in times of Ignorance and Superstition; and we know, whether of the two we ought to prefer. *Baronius* is more ingenuous, who saith (x), *These Bishops at Elliberis chiefly endeavoured, (x) Baron. An. by strict Penalties, to affright the Faithful from Idolatry; 305. §. 45. wherefore they made the 34th, 36th and 37th Canons; and by comparing the First Canon with the Forty sixth, it appears, they dealt more severely with an Idolater, than an Apostate.* From whence we infer, That Pictures in Churches tend to Idolatry, in this Councils Opinion. *Albaspinaeus* (whose Notes *Labbé* here prints (y)) would (y) *Lab. p. 998* enervate this Canon, by saying, *It forbids not the Saints Pictures,*

*Pictures; but those which represented God and the Holy Trinity.* But it is not probable, these Primitive Christians were so ignorant, as to need any prohibition about such blasphemous Representations of God's Majesty. And he brings no proof, but his own bare Conjecture for this limitation of the Canon; which Fancy (if it were true) would prove, That the Saints were not worshiped or adored in that Age; because nothing that was worshiped and adored, was to be painted on the Walls; and if that be meant only of God and the Trinity, then nothing else but God and the Trinity was adored in those days: Finally, the former part of the Canon destroys this limitation, by excluding Pictures in general out of Churches. These are the various Fallacies by which these partial Editors, would hide the manifest Novelty of their Churches, Worship of Pictures, which cannot be defended by all these Tricks.

I will only add, That this genuine Ancient Council in the Fifty third Canon, Orders, *The same Bishop who Excommunicated a Man, to Absolve him; and that if any other intermeddled, He should be called to an account for*

(z) *Lab. p. 976.* it (z); without excepting the Pope, or taking notice of *Bin. pag. 196.C* Marcellus's pretended claim of Appeals.

§. 3. In the Year 306, was a Council at Carthage against the *Donatists*, which never takes any notice of the Pope; yet they put into the Title of it, *Under* (a) *Lab. p. 1379.* Marcellus (a). But there is a worse Forgery in the Notes, where S. Augustine is cited, as saying, *That Cecilian (Bishop of Carthage) despised the Censures of the Donatists, because he was joyned in Communion with the Bishop of the Roman Church, from which all Catholic Communion, was ever wont to be denominated: But this is Baronius his false gloss, not S. Augustine's words, who only saith, ——— because he was united by Communicatory*

(b) *Aug. ep. 62.* Letters, both to the Roman Church, wherein the Principality of the Catholic Church had always flourished, and to other Lands from whence the Gospel came to Africa (b). *Tom. II. p. 150.* Vid. Baron. An. 306. §. 40.

Now

Now there is great difference between a Man being a Catholic, because he was in Communion with *Rome* (then Orthodox) and with other Churches; and his being a Catholic merely for being in Communion with the Roman Bishop, which is the modern and false notion of the word *Catholic*, among Papists, in our days: But *Binius* was so convinced, that *S. Augustine's* words confuted *Baronius's* Paraphrase, that he cunningly leaves them out, to make this commodious Sense of them go better down with careless Readers.

§. 4. The next Pope *Eusebius*, was so obscure, (as the Notes on his Life declare) that no Writer mentions any thing of him that is memorable (c); and it is probable, there never was such a Pope: Yet the Pontifical saith, The Cross was found in his time, upon the 5th of the Nones of May, which is the very Day on which the Roman Church now celebrates *The Invention of the Cross*: And the Third Decretal Epistle of this Pope, was devised on purpose to support this Story; yet both *Baronius* and *Binius* reject it for a Fable, even while their Church still observes that Holy-day. There are Three Epistles forged for this Name of a Pope, all which *Labbe* owns to be spurious (d); and I need not spend much time to prove it, since they cite the Vulgar Latin Version, and are mostly stolen out of Modern Authors, (as *Labbe's* Margin shews) having only one Consul's Name for their Dates, because no other was named in the Pontifical. Besides, the first Epistle uses the Phrase, *Pro saluatione servorum Dei*, which is not the Latin of that Age; and talks of *Rigorous Tortures* used among Christians, to make Witnesses confess Truth. The second Epistle repeats the foolish Argument, of *Christ's whipping the Buyers and Sellers* (many of which were Laymen) out of the Temple, to prove, that God alone must judge Priests; and out of a much later Roman Council, (suspected also of Forgery) speaks of the Peoples not judging

(c) *Lab. p. 1380.*  
*Bin. pag. 203.*  
col. 1.

(d) *Lab. p. 1381.*  
*Bin. pag. 203.*  
col. 1.

judging their Bishop, unless he err in Matters of Faith—; and discourses of Edicts of Kings, forbidding to try an ejected Bishop, till he be restored to his place. The third Epistle hath the Fable of the Invention of the Cross, and all other Marks of Forgery on it; yet *Bellarmino* cites it to prove, the Pope's Succession to *S. Peter*, in his *Universal Monarchy*; and to make out Confirmation to be a Sacrament (e). So little do those Writers value the credit of any Evidence, if it do but make for their Churches Authority, or support its Doctrines.

(e) *Bellarmino* de Pontif. Rom. lib. 2. cap. 14. & de Confirm. lib. 2. cap. 3.

§ 5. The Seven years Vacancy being now expired, *Melchisedech* was chosen Pope, and Sat Three years and Seven Months, according to the *Pontifical* (f); and though the Ecclesiastical Tables (as they call them) generally follow this Author; yet *Baronius* here by them corrects the *Pontifical*, and allows *Melchisedech* only Two Years and Two Months: But all this is Conjecture, for he grants the Consuls in the *Pontifical* are so false, that they cannot be reconciled to Truth (g); whence it follows, That the Decretal Epistle ascribed to this Pope, whose Matter is taken from the *Pontifical*, and whose Date is by those who were not Consuls till after *Melchisedech's* Death (h), must be false also: Yet the Notes defend this Forged Epistle, and *Bellarmino* cites it for the Supremacy, and for Confirmations being a Sacrament (i), whereas the beginning of it is stolen out of *Celestine's* Epistle to the French (k); it quotes the Vulgar Translation, and cites an Apostolical Privilege granted to *Rome*, for the sole right of Trying Bishops; to justify which, The Notes cite the 73<sup>d</sup> and 74<sup>th</sup> Apostolical Canons; but those Canons, order Bishops to judge an offending Bishop, and make the last appeal to a Synod, without taking any notice of *Rome*, or of this pretended Privilege. Again, this Feigned Epistle impudently makes Confirmation more venerable than Baptism; and the Notes defend that bold Expression: But we cannot but wonder, (since

(f) *Lab.* p. 1394. *Bin.* pag. 209. col. 1.

(g) *Baron.* An. 311. §. 43.

(h) *Lab.* p. 1400. A. in Marg.

(i) *Bellarmino* ubi supra (e).

(k) *Lab.* p. 1395. D, E.



## Part II. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

59

(since they assert, *That Bishops by Gods Law have the sole power of Confirming*;) the same Men should grant, *That the Pope can give a Priest leave to Confirm, Which yet (they say) changes not the Divine Right of Bishops* (l); That is in plain terms, One mans sole Right may be delegated to another, by a Third person, without any injury to him who had the sole Right.

(l) Lab. p. 1400.  
E. Bin. p. 211.  
col. 2.

After this follows a Council at Rome under *Melchisedes*, wherein the Pope, by delegation from the Emperor, is joyned in Commission with Three French Bishops, (who are called his Collegues) to hear the *Donatists* complaint against *Cecilian Bishop of Carthage* (m), and *Constantine* not only received the *Donatists* first Appeal, and delegated this Cause to *Melchisedes* and his Fellow Commissioners; but upon a second Complaint, ordered this Matter to be heard over again in a French Council, which the Pope in Council had determined. Now this so clearly shews, that the Pope was not Supreme Judge in those days, that *Baronius* and *Binius* are hard put to it, to Blunder this Instance: The Notes say, *Constantine was yet raw in the Faith*; and yet they say also, *He knew by Gods Law, nothing was to be done without the chief Bishop*. But they are forced to prove this by a false Translation of *Constantine's* Epistle to *Melchisedes* (n), the words of which in Greek are, *Τὸ ὁστανωτάτω νόμον ἀποδέξασθαι*, which in their Version is, *As the most holy Law of God requires*; but *Valesius's* Translation (which *Labbe* gives us) is, *As is agreeable to the most Venerable Law*; That is, (as all men know) to the Imperial Laws: So that *Constantine* only says, He had ordered the Accusers and Accused, all to appear at Rome before these delegated Judges, as the Venerable Laws (which order both Parties to be present when a Cause is tryed) do require; and by the help of a false Translation this occasion is made use of, to make the Credulous believe, *That Gods Law required all Causes should be tryed at Rome*: Whereas it is apparent by this Instance, That a Cause once Tryed there before the Pope,

m) Lab. p. 1401.  
Bin. pag. 212.  
col. 1.

(n) Lab. p. 1407.  
Bin. pag. 212.  
col. 2.

might be tryed over again in *France*, if the Emperor pleased.

The two following Epistles of *Constantine* out of (o) *Lab. p. 1430. Pirbæus* his Manuscript (o), are very suspicious; the first speaks more magnificently of Christ than one who (as they say) was so raw in the Faith was like to do: And in it *Constantine* is made to decline Judging in *Bishops Causes*; which is a protestation against his own Act, and a contradiction to the second Epistle, wherein He declares, that this Episcopal Cause shall be tryed before himself: Nor is this first Epistle Recorded in *Eusebius*, or agreeable to *Constantine's* Style; so that we suppose, that was devised by such as designed to persuade Princes, That Bishops were above them: For which purpose *Baronius* here cites a Law of this Emperor to *Ablavius* (p), Giving men leave to choose Bishops for their Judges, and not allowing them after that to appeal to Secular Courts; because they had been heard by Judges of their own choosing: But *Baronius* perverts this, to signify, That Bishops were above Secular Judges by their ordinary Jurisdiction, whereas they were not so in any Cause of this kind, but only when they were extraordinarily chosen Arbitrators; and so *Sozomen* expounds this Law.

(p) *Baron.*  
An. 314. §. 38,  
39.

An. Dom. 314,

§. 6. We are now arrived at the time of Pope *Sylvester*, who living about the time when *Constantine* publicly professed Christianity, and being Pope when the *Nicene Council* was called; yet no Author of Credit, records his being much concerned in these grand Revolutions: Upon which the Annalist, and our Editors rake into all kind of Forgeries, and devise most improbable Stories, to set off Pope *Sylvester* as very considerable; but we shall look into the Original of the Emperor's becoming a Christian, which will discover all their Fallacies.

*Constantine* was born of Christian Parents, and brought up under them, and was Thirty years old when he entred on the Empire: And from the Year 306 (q) He

(q) *Baron.*  
An. 306. §. 14.

He professed openly he was a Christian, Making Laws to encourage Converts, and to suppress Paganism throughout his Empire, Building and Endowing Churches, and granting great Immunities to the Clergy; yet all this while He took no notice of *Marcellus, Eusebius, or Melchisedes, S. Peter's Successors*, and pretended Monarchs of the Church. After Seven years having Vanquished *Maxentius at Rome*, they say, He gave to the Pope his Palace of the *Lateran* (r): (r) *Lab. p. 1394. Biv. pag. 209. col. 1. Baron. An. 312. §. 82, & §. 85.*

The Notes cite *Optatus* for this; but he only saith, *A Council of Nineteen Bishops met in the Lateran*; but it doth not follow from thence, that *Constantine* had then given the Pope this fair Palace. Again, *Baronius* (without any ancient Author for it) saith, *That Constantine gave S. Peter thanks for his Victory over Maxentius*; yet at the same time he affirms, *He was yet a Pagan, and durst not by his Acts declare himself a Christian* (s). Very strange! Were not Building Churches, selling Christianity by a Law, giving his Palace to the Pope, and (as they say) *Fixing the Trophy of the Cross in the midst of Rome* (t), Acts sufficient to declare him a Christian? No, He must be a Pagan Eleven years after this, and a Persecutor; yea, in the year 324 He was so meer a Heathen as to know nothing of the Christian Rites, but what an *Egyptian* taught him. After he had openly professed this Religion Eighteen years, He had forgot it all, and turned so great a Tyrant, that Pope *Sylvester* (who had no great mind to be a Martyr) ran away into the Mount *Soracte*, or was banished thither: But *Constantine*, after He had been Ten years Pope, never had heard of him, till being struck with a Leprosie (mentioned in no Authentic Writer) two glorious Persons, whose Faces he knew not, appeared to the Emperor, and ordered him to send for Pope *Sylvester* to cure him; who (when He was come) first shewed *Constantine* these two glorious Persons were *S. Peter and S. Paul*, and then Cured him; made him a Christian, and Baptized him. Which idle and self-contradicting Romance is magnified by

(s) *Baron. An. 312. §. 58, & §. 62.*

(t) *Biv. p. 208 col. 2.*

*Baro-*

*Baronius's* and *Binius's* Notes; but we will now confute it as briefly as we can.

§. 7. First, This whole Story is devised, to exalt the Glory of the *Roman* Church; to make Men believe the Pope could work Miracles, and that the first Christian Emperor was Baptized at *Rome*: But then it casts such a blot upon *Constantine's* Memory, and feigns such odious and incredible things of him, as no wise Man can believe concerning a Prince, who *S. Augustine* saith, was a Christian Eight years before this (u). And whoever reads in *Baronius*, the History of the first Ten years of *Sylvester*, from *An.* 314 till *An.* 324, and observes what glorious Things he saith of *Constantine's* Religious Laws, his Piety to God, his Zeal for Christianity, his Respect to Confessors, and his Bounty to Bishops; his taking part with the Catholics against Heretics and Schismatics: He can never believe this scandalous Story of so excellent a Prince. But in all this Period of Time, *Baronius* himself cannot find one Evidence, That ever *Constantine* had any correspondence with *Sylvester*, and therefore Christianity was settled in the Empire without the Pope's help: To cover which great Truth, some dull (but zealous Monk) long since invented this Sham Story, to save the Credit of *Rome*; and the Annalist and these Notes strive to defend it.

Secondly, This Fable chiefly relies on the Credit of the *Pontifical*, (so often proved false) and upon the repute of *Sylvester's* Acts: But the Annotator at first ominously Charges them both with Falshood (w); the former mistakes the Time of the Vacancy, and the latter (he saith) is wrong in making *Melchisedech* ordain *Sylvester* a Priest, he being Ordained by *Marcellinus* long before. *Baronius* also confesseth, That these Acts of *Sylvester* are so false in many particulars, that it shakes the Credit of the whole (x). But it is very strange, after he (who is so concerned for their Reputation) had found so many Flaws in them, he should justify them even where they

(u) *Baron. An.*  
316. §. 59, &  
62, 63.

(w) *Lab. p.* 1416.  
*Bin. pag.* 217.  
col. 1.

(x) *Baron. An.*  
nal. 311. §. 59.  
& *An.* 315.  
§. 10, 11, & 12.  
& *An.* 324.  
§. 41.

they contradict all the Historians of the Age; which can spring from nothing but a Resolution to maintain every thing which made for the Credit of the Roman See.

Thirdly, The Notes say not only the Acts of *Sylvester*, but *Zosimus* and *Sozomen* do both attest this Story: Now first, *Zosimus* was a Pagan, and *Baronius* and *Binius* confess, He tells many Malicious Lies of *Constantine*, for suppressing the Heathen Religion; and though they confute the rest of his Calumnies, they defend his Relation of *Constantine's* Baptism, as founding something like those forged Acts (y); and though his Account of it reflect as much upon *Constantine*, as is possible; yet the Annalist and Annotator labour to prove this Spightful Heathen to be a truer Historian, than *Sozomen*, *Socrates*, or *Eusebius*, whom they represent as Lyars and Flatterers, not to be believed against *Zosimus*. Yet there is a mighty difference between this Pagan's History of the Baptism of *Constantine*, and that in *Sylvester's* Acts: *Zosimus* saith, It was a Spaniard, named *Egyptius*, lately by the Court Ladies brought acquainted with *Constantine*, who advised him to be Baptized; and this the Notes say was *Hofius*; yet it is plain, *Hofius* was *Constantine's* Intimate Friend, and his Legate into *Egypt* Twelve years before (z). Besides, *Zosimus* doth not name *Sylvester*, and only designed by his Relation to blacken *Constantine*, and represent Christianity as a Sanctuary for Villanies, which could not be expiated among the Pagans: But the Acts discourse of a Persecution, and a Leprosie, and make *Peter* and *Paul* the Advisers of *Constantine's* Baptism; and their business is only to set up *Sylvester's* Name. And the Stories (like all Falshoods) do not hang together: As for *Sozomen*, he is no Evidence for *Sylvester's* Acts, nor doth he once name that Pope in the place cited (a). He only confutes the scandalous Stories, which *Zosimus* had falsly told of *Constantine*, shewing how improbable it is, that this Emperor (after he had Reigned nigh Twenty years) should need a New

(y) *Baron. An.*  
324. §. 17.

(x) *Baron. An.*  
312. §. 91.

(a) *Sozom. hist.*  
lib. I. cap. 5.

Con-

Conversion; and how unlikely it must be, that the Pagans would not have found out some Rites to expiate him, that so they might secure him in their Religion: So that he is a Witness, That these Reports of *Constantine* were false, and invented by Malicious Heathens, and so far as *Zosimus* and *Sylvester's* Acts agree, he confutes them both; and since he lived within an Hundred years after this time, while some alive might possibly remember these Passages; His early denial of these Fictions is better Evidence against them, than *Baronius* and *Binius's* Testimony for them, after Thirteen hundred years; to serve a Turn, and do Honour to that Church they resolve to Magnifie.

Fourthly, The Notes speak of *Sylvester's* Returning to *Rome* in great glory; which is not mentioned in *Zosimus* nor *Sozomen*, and only relies on the Credit of these Acts (b): Which have no Evidence to Attest them, but Pope *Adrian*, who perhaps forged them; or however, first produced these Acts in the Second *Niceene* Council, Four hundred and Fifty years after *Sylvester's* time, to prove the use of Images in *Constantine's* Days. But the very Acts declare, That *Constantine* (who had Built and Adorned so many Churches, and if Images or Pictures had then been used, must have seen the Faces of *S. Peter* and *S. Paul*) did not know the Faces of these two great Apostles, till *Sylvester* shewed them their Images. Whence we infer, That the Acts are no good Proof for Images, if they were Authentic; and their being first cited in an Ignorant Council, made up of Forgeries and False Stories, gives us good Reason to believe them Spurious.

§. 8. The Annotator in the next place asserts confidently, That *Constantine* was Baptized at *Rome* by *Sylvester*, Anno 324 (c): But his Proofs are very weak, viz. First, He cites a Roman Council for this, held the same year: But the Style of that Council is so barbarous, the Sentences so incoherent, and the Matter of Fact

(b) *Lab.* p. 1417.  
*Bin.* pag. 217.  
 col. 2.

(c) *Lab.* p. 1417.  
*Bin.* pag. 217.  
 col. 2.



Fact so false, that *Labbé* owns it is a Forgery, and *Binius* confesses it is suspicious (d); so that this can be no evidence: Nor Secondly, *Anastasius Bibliothecarius*, who lived Five hundred and Fifty years after this time, and was a meer Sycophant of the Popes, to set up whose Supremacy (then newly hatched) he stuck at nothing, and that spoils his Credit. Thirdly, *Zosimus* is a malicious Lying Writer, as to *Constantine*; and though he do say, *Constantine* was Baptized at *Rome*, he doth not affirm, that *Sylvester* Baptized him: Fourthly, *Sozomen* only relates *Zosimus* his Story to confute it; so that not one of his Witnesses do prove the matter: Yet these Authors with a weak Conjecture, That *Constantine* could not have been present in the *Nicene* Council, if he had not been Baptized before (which we will presently confute) is all the Evidence that *Baronius* and these Notes can give for this incredible Story: But on the other side, there are many clear Proofs, that he was baptized at *Nicomedia*, a little before his death.

First, *Eusebius* (who lived at that time, and knew *Constantine* very well, and writ his History soon after) doth affirm this: And if it had been False, many then alive who could remember it, would doubtless have exposed him for so manifest a Fiction. The Notes say he Forged this Story in favour of *Constantinus*; but he must be very Ridiculous, if he would be obliged by a Story of his Father, which many hundreds as well as himself, must have then known to be a Falshood; And *Eusebius* must be as silly as he was knavish, to invent a Fable so easy to be disproved by living Witnesses: But the Notes wrong *Eusebius*, when they say, he reports that *Constantine* died Impious and alienated from the Catholic Church; For *Eusebius* saith he made a most Christian and Pious end: However *Eusebius* by this Testimony brings upon himself, all the Rage and Spite of *Baronius* and our Annotator, who upon all occasions Blast this Holy and Learned Writer, to whose pains they and all the Christian World are infinitely beholding; and though while *Eusebius*'s History continues, it be almost the only

true Record used by *Baronius* in compiling his Annals; yet he and *Binius* in every Page almost do revile him as an *Arian* and a Writer of Lies: But there is so much Malice, and so little probability in the Accusation, that their own Writers and ours also do vindicate *Eusebius* from these Slanders (e), and we could easily confute these Calumnies, but only that in this Relation he is so certainly in the Right, that we need not consider his Opinion in other things, but will shew as to this particular he is supported by the best Evidence imaginable. For

(e) *Valesij. præf. ad edit. Euseb. Dr. Carve life of Euseb. pag. 31.*

Secondly, *Theodoret* also saith, that *Constantine* was Baptized a little before his Death at *Nicomedia* (f); and though that *Eusebius*, who was Bishop of that City, was an *Arian*, yet he dissembled his Heresie while *Constantine* lived, and the Emperor had restored *Athanasius*, contrary to this Bishop's mind; wherefore though he was forced to make use of an *Arian* Bishop to Baptize him, being taken ill in that City, yet it will not follow that *Constantine* died an *Arian*: Moreover that *Constantine* was Baptized at *Nicomedia*, is attested also by *Socrates* (g) and *Sozomen* (h); and also by the Chronicles of *Isidore* and *S. Hierom* (i), and by *S. Ambrose* in his Funeral Oration for *Theodosius*; Yea, *Athanasius*, and a whole Synod at *Ariminum*, do expressly declare, that *Constantine* was Baptized a little before his Death; that is, Thirteen years after this pretended Baptism at *Rome* (k), which last Testimony *Baronius* and the Notes presume to corrupt, and contrary to all the best Copies, and the necessary Sense of the place, put *Constans* his Name into the Text instead of *Constantine*: So that in fine the only Question is now, Whether we will believe these two Modern partial Writers, with those most Fabulous (but as they call them *most approved*) Acts of *Sylvester*, first cited by Pope *Adrian* 450 years after: Or we will believe the concurrent Witness of all the Ancient and Eminent Writers of that and the next Ages; to whom if we give Credit, then *Constantine's* Baptism at *Rome* by *Sylvester*, is a meer Forgery devised for

(g) *Socrat. hist. lib. 1. cap. 26.*

(h) *Sozom. lib. 2. cap. 32.*

(i) *Baron. An. 324. §. 47.*

(k) *Athanasius de Synod. pag. 243.*

*Epistol. Synod. Arim. ap.*

*Socrat. lib. 2. cap. 29. & So-*

*zom. lib. 4. cap. 17.*

## Part II. *Roman Forgeries in the Council.*

67

the glory of the Roman Church, and for that only reason so eagerly defended by this Annotator and the Annalist.

§. 9. Together with this Fable we must also reject the Fiction of *Constantine's* Leprosy, which was invented only that *Sylvester* might cure it (l); and therefore the Notes prove it very slenderly, viz. First, By those Acts of *Sylvester*, in which they confess *there are many Errors* (m): Secondly, By a Roman Council, which is as manifest a Forgery as the Acts themselves: Thirdly, By a Metaphorical expression of *Gregorius Turonensis*, a credulous Writer, who lived 300 years after this, and yet even he doth not expressly affirm it. Fourthly, But the Annotator tells us the Gentile Historians do confirm this, though he names but one, viz. *Michael Glycas*, who unluckily proves a Christian Monk, living in *Sicily*, Anno 1120, about 800 years after this time, and long after *Adrian* and his *Nicene* Council had dispersed *Sylvester's* Acts, out of which *Glycas* took this Fable upon Trust: So that at last he only proves the Acts, by the Acts themselves and by Pope *Adrian*; and that is all the Authority he hath for this feigned Leprosy, which Disease no Writer (of Credit and Antiquity) saith *Constantine*, ever had; no not that Malicious *Zosimus*, who raked up all the Odious things against this Emperor he could devise; and if ever he had been struck by Heaven with Leprosy, no doubt he would have Blazed it abroad with great Pleasure.

§. 10. The Book of *Constantine's* Munificence, is grounded on the Fable of his Baptism, and seems to be Forged by the same Hand with *Sylvester's* Acts: So that we ought also to reject it as a Fiction: *Anastasis*, who put it out, was the Pope's Library-keeper; and whether he made it, or found it in the *Vatican*, that *Shop of Lies* (as *Richerius* calls it) the Credit of it is invalidated, by reason, no Author of Repute or Antiquity, mentions any of these Gifts: It says blasphemously, *Constantine gave a*

K 2

Saviour

- (n) *Lab. p. 1420.* *Saviour sitting five foot high* (so it calls a dead Image (n);) But if this were true, why did not *Adrian* cite this in his *Nicene Council*? Or why did this Emperor's Sister write to *Eusebius* Bishop of *Cæsarea* for an Image of Christ, when *Sylvester* could more easily have furnished her? and by the way, the Notes fraudulently mention this Messager (o), but do not relate how severely *Eusebius* reproved that Lady for seeking after a visible Image of Christ: The Annotator also cites *Paulinus* to prove this Book of Munificence; but he writ near 100 years after; and though he speak of a fine Church of *S. Peter* in *Rome*; yet he saith not that *Constantine* either founded or adorned it: *Baronius* attempts to prove this Book by near Conjectures, by the Forged Acts, and by *Nicephorus*, a late Author, whom he often taxes for Fictions (p); but he can produce no ancient or eminent Author for it: And yet it is certain, if *Constantine*, had given so many and so great gifts to the Head City of the World, some of the most Famous Writers would have Recorded it: Besides, the Cardinal himself rejects both the idle Story of *S. Agnes* Temple, (attested by a Fiction ascribed to *S. Ambrose*) told in this very Book (q); and the apparent Falshood of *Constantine's* now burying his Mother in one of these Churches, who was alive long after (r): So that by his own Confession there are divers Falshoods in this Book; and he had been more Ingenuous if he had owned the whole to be (as it really is) a Forgery.
- (o) *Not. Y. Bin. pag. 219. col. 2. & Lab. p. 1421.*
- (p) *Baron. An. 324. §. 72. & 75.*
- (q) *Baron. An. 324. §. 107.*
- (r) *Idem, An. 324. §. 114.*

*An. Dom. 314.* §. 11. The Editors now go back to the Council of *Arles*, held (as they say) *Anno 314* (s): And it troubles them much, to ward off the Blows which it gives to their beloved Supremacy: For it was appointed by the Emperor, upon an Appeal made to him by the *Donatists*, to judge a cause over again, which had been judged before by *Melchιάdes* and his Roman Council; (the Pope in Council it seems, being not then taken to be Infallible: ) 'Tis true, in the Title, which these Editors give us, this Council directs their Canons, *To their Lord and*

## Part II. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

69

and most Holy Brother Sylvester the Bishop, and say, they had sent them to him, that all might know (the Pope not excepted) what they were to observe: So that though in Respect they call him Lord, yet they stile him also a Brother, and expect his obedience to their Decrees; nor do they (as the Notes pretend,) desire him to confirm these Canons (t); But only require the Pope who held the larger Diocess, that he would openly acquaint all with them, as their Letter speaks: That is, as he was a Metropolitan, to give notice of these Canons to all his Province, which was then called a Diocess; and Baronius is forced to point the Sentence falsely to make it sound, toward his beloved Supremacy (u). So in the First Canon, Pope Sylvester is ordered by this Council to give notice to all, of the Day on which Easter was to be observed: That is, he was to write to all his Neighbouring Bishops under his Jurisdiction about it, not as the Notes say (w); That he was to determine the day, and by virtue of his Office to write to all the Bishops of the Christian World to observe it: The Council had ordered the Day, and command the Pope to give notice to all about him to keep it: And in the Famous Nicene Council, The Bishop of Alexandria (living where Astronomy was well understood) was appointed first to settle, and then to certify the day of Easter; yet none will infer from hence, that he was the Head of the Catholic Church, because he had this Duty imposed on him, which as yet, is more than the Council of Arles did put upon the Bishop of Rome. Again, the Notes are very angry at the Emperor, for receiving the Donatists appeal from the Pope and his Council, which they say Constantine owned to be an unjust and impious thing (x); but they prove this only by a forged Epistle mentioned but now, § 5. But it is certain Constantine, (though a Catechumen, which they pretended was impossible at Nice) was present in this Council, and so he must act against his Conscience, if he had thought it unjust, and impious to judge in Ecclesiastical Causes: And in this Emperor's Letter to Abilavinus, he saith; God had committed all Earthly things to his ordering

(t) Lab. p. 143.  
Bin. pag. 223.  
col. 2.

(u) Baron An.  
314. §. 68.

(w) Lab. p. 1434.  
Bin. pag. 224.  
col. 1.  
Baron An. 314.  
§. 58.

(x) Not in  
Concil Aret.  
Bin. pag. 221.  
col. 2.

ordering: and in that to *Celsus* he promises to come into Africa, to enquire and judge of things done both by the People and the Clergy (y). And indeed *Constantine*, by all his practice sufficiently declared, he thought it lawful enough for him to judge in Ecclesiastical matters. Finally, the Notes say the Bishops met in this Council, at the Emperor's request (z); Now that shews it was not at the Pope's request; but indeed *Constantine's* Letter to *Cbreftus*, expressly Commands the Bishops to meet; The Notes also out of *Balduinus* or *Optatus*, (or rather from an obscure Fragment cited by him) say, *Sylvest-er was President of this Council; Baronius* addeth of his own head—namely by his Legates (a), which guesses *Binius* puts down for a certain truth: But it is ridiculous to fancy that a pair of Priests, and as many Deacons in that Age, should sit above the Emperor, when himself was present in that Council; So that though we allow the Pope's Messengers to have been at this Council, there is no proof that they presided in it: We shall only add, that instead of *Arians* in the Eighth Canon, we must Read *Africans*: or else we must not fix this Council so early as *An. 314*, at which time the *Arians* were not known by that name.

§. 12. In the same year is placed the Council of *An-cyra*, which the Editors do not (as usually) say was under *Sylvester*, but only in his time (b); and it is well they are so modest; for doubtless he had no Hand in it; the Notes confess that it was called by the Authority of *Vitalis Bishop of Antioch* (c): *Balsamon* and *Zonaras* say *Vitalis* of *Antioch*, *Agricolaus* of *Cæsarea*, and *Basil* of *Amasea*, were the Presidents of it (d). Yet not only *Leo* the Fourth, but the famous Council of *Nice*, approved of this Synod called and carried on without the Pope's knowledge or leave: There is but one Canon in this Council which contradicts the Roman practice, viz. The Ninth, which allows Deacons to Marry and continue in their Office, if they declared at their Ordination that they could not live Single: This Canon therefore

*Baronius*

(y) *Baron. Ann.*  
316. §. 62.

(z) *Lab. p. 1423*  
*Bin. pag. 222.*  
col. 2.

(a) *Baron. Ann.*  
314. §. 51.

(b) *Lab. p. 1455.*  
*Bin. pag. 225.*

(c) *Lab. p. 1478.*  
*Bin. pag. 232.*  
col. 2.

(d) *Beveridg.*  
*Council Tom. I.*  
pag. 375.



*Baronius* and *Binius* strive to corrupt with false Glosses : The former saith, *We may by this Canon see how firmly Ministers single Life was asserted, not only in the whole Catholick Church but in the East* (c). Now it is very strange, that a private Canon of a Provincial Council, which allows one Order of Ministers to Marry, should shew it was the Opinion of the whole Church, that none might Marry : The latter in his Notes affirms That, *this among other Canons solidly proves, that not only Priests, but Deacons (by the Apostolical Law) were bound to Live without Wives* (f) : But the Apostles certainly allowed Deacons to have Wives ; and this Canon was made on purpose, that they might live with their Wives, if they pleased : The Notes proceed to say, *That Deacons ordained against their Will, and protesting they could not contain, were by these Fathers permitted to Marry after their Ordination, provided they left off all Sacred Administrations, and did not Communicate among the Priests in the Chancel, but among the People* : Which is an impudent falsification ; There being no word of *being Ordained unwillingly* ; nor any reason why they should be Ordained, who were to be reduced presently to Lay-communion : Yea, the Words of the Canon are express, *that if they did Marry, they should continue in their Ministry* (g) ; So that these Editors make no Conscience, to make these ancient Records to contradict themselves, rather then let them seem to oppose their Churches present practice : For which vile purpose there is another trick in the Notes on this Council ; For whereas the Eighteenth Canon speaks of Lay-persons which Vowed single Life, (as many had done in times of Persecution) and afterwards broke their Vow, that these were to be counted Bigamists ; The Notes (h) on this Canon, put these Words of the Thirteenth Canon, *Those who are of the Clergy, &c.* Before their observation on the Eighteenth Canon, on purpose to make the Reader think the Clergy in those days, Vowed single Life as they do now at *Rome*.

(c) *Baron. Ann.*  
314. §. 88.

(f) *Lab. p. 1478.*  
*Bin. pag. 223.*  
col. 2.

(g) *Γαμήται  
ἔς ἑσώμα ἐν  
τῇ ὑμένειᾳ.*  
*Vid Bever. not.*  
*Tom. II. p. 175.*

(h) *Bin. p. 233.*  
col. 2.

- §. 13. The Council of *Næocæsarea* (according to these Editors) was *under Sylvester* (i), who is not once named in it, nor doth it appear he knew of it: They might also have left out *Leo* the Fourth's approving it Five hundred years after, because the Notes say, *The Council of Nice allowed it, which is much more for its Credit* (k). The same Notes say, *The first Canon orders the same thing, which was decreed in the Thirty third Canon at Elliberis, and the Ninth at Ancyra*: And if so, that is not, (as they falsely gloss the Canon of *Ancyra*) *That the Clergy should live Single, or be reduced to Lay-Communion*: For in that Canon some of the Clergy are allowed to Marry, and to continue to minister as Clergy-men still. And the true Sense of this *Næocæsarean* Canon is, That whereas in times of Persecution, when Marriage was inconvenient, many Priests promised to live Single: Now these only were not allowed to Marry afterward (l); but when the Church had Peace, the *Nicene* Council left all Clergy-men free, to Marry or not, as they pleased; which shews, That when the Reason of this Canon ceased, they believed its Obligation did so also. The Fifth Canon *forbids a Catechumen, who falls into Sin, to enter into the Church*: By which the Notes say, That *Baronius* had sharply censured *Eusebius* (m): But it is plain, that *Baronius* shews more Malice than Wit in that Censure: *Eusebius* only relates Matter of Fact, That *Constantine* was present in the *Nicene* Council, and he (with all ancient Authors) agrees, That *Constantine* was yet a Catechumen; where then is the Crime? Do not *Baronius* and *Binius* both agree, that *Constantine* was present in the Council of *Arles*, Ten years before his pretended Baptism at *Rome*? And if it be said, *This Canon forbid it*: I ask, *Whether it be probable, that an Emperor* (who, as *Baronius* saith, was *Solutus Legibus, Above the Civil Law*) *should be proceeded against by a Canon of a small Provincial Council*? Wherefore *Eusebius* his only Crime is, That he tells a Truth, which happens to contradict the Lying Acts

(i) Lab. p. 1479.  
Bin. pag. 233.

(k) Lab. p. 1489.  
Bin. pag. 236.  
col. 2.

(l) Vid. Ber-  
ridg. Not. in  
Concil. Nicen.  
Tom. II. p. 180.

(m) Vid. Baron.  
An. 324. §. 49.

Acts of *Sylvester*, and consequently the Interest of *Rome*, for which the Cardinal and Annotator can never forgive him.

The next place is assigned to a *Roman Council*, under *Sylvester*, wherein there was a famous Disputation between the Jews and Christians, before *Constantine* and *Helena*; but in the Notes (n) we are told the Story is utterly false, only attested by *Sylvester's Acts*, which <sup>(n) Lab. p. 1491. Bin. pag. 237. col. 1.</sup> *Swarm with Lies*, as they are now extant; (yet out of <sup>Vid. Baron. An. 315. §. 12.</sup> these Acts, as now extant, is the Forgery of *Constantine's Baptism* at *Rome* taken;) and therefore *Baronius* and *Binius* reject this Council as a meer Forgery. But why do they not reject *Constantine's Baptism*, as well as this Council, since both rely on the same Author? The Reason is plain, That makes for the Interest of the Pope, and This no way concerns; and so it may pass for a Forgery, as it is.

6. 14. On occasion of *Arius's* Heresie now breaking <sup>An. Dom. 315.</sup> out at *Alexandria*, there was a Council of an Hundred Bishops called by *Alexander*, Bishop of that City, to Condemn him; which first Council of *Alexandria* (the Editors say) was under *Sylvester*; but it doth not appear that this Pope knew of it till Three years after (o), <sup>(o) Lab. p. 1492. Bin. pag. 237. col. 2.</sup> *An. 318*; at which time *Alexander* gave notice of this Council (not to *Sylvester* by name, as the Notes falsely suggest, but) to all Catholic Bishops, and in particular to the Bishop of *Constantinople*. But for fear the Reader should observe, That more respect was shewed to that Bishop, than to the Pope, the Editors have removed these Epistles of *Alexander* into the Body of the *Nicene Council*, and only give us Notes upon them here, in which the Annotator out of *Baronius* turns the Charge of Lying and Forgery, of which <sup>(p) Baron. An. nal. 318. §. 18. Bin. pag. 239. col. 1.</sup> themselves have been so often convicted, upon us, whom they falsely call Innovators (p). Four years after followed a Second Council at *Alexandria*, which the <sup>(q) Lab. p. 1493. Bin. pag. 239. col. 1.</sup> Notes hope to prove was under *Sylvester* (q), because *Atbanasius* saith, This was a General Council, and

L

saith,

(r) *Baron. An.*  
318. §. 22. &c.

(s) *Baron. An.*  
312. §. 91. & 92.

(t) *Bin. Not.*  
p. 240. col. 2. &c.  
*Baron. An.* 318.  
§. 91.

(u) *Lab. p.* 1495.  
*Bin. pag.* 241.

saith, *Hosius* was there: Upon this *Baronius*, fancying nothing could be a General Council unless the Pope were present Personally or by his Legates, conjectures *Hosius* was the Pope's Legate, and in that capacity presided in this Council (r): And the Notes positively affirm this Dream for a certain Truth. But *Albanasius* calls many Synods General, which were only Provincial; and it is plain, he had not the modern Roman Notion of a General Council, because he never mentions *Sylvester*, nor doth he say, *Hosius* was his Legate. But even *Baronius* owns, that *Hosius* was *Constantine's* intimate Friend, and his Legate into *Egypt* six years before (s); and *Socrates* saith, He was now again sent thither as the Emperor's Legate; and no doubt, if he did preside in this Council, it was not as *Sylvester's* Legate (whom no ancient Author records, to have had any hand in this Council,) but as the Legate of *Constantine*. After these two Councils is placed a Letter of this Emperors to *Alexander* and *Arius*, taken out of *Eusebius*, but is misplaced by the Editors; since it is plain, it was written in the beginning of the Controversie about *Arius*, and not only before *Constantine* understood any thing of the matter, but before these Councils at *Alexandria*: But *Baronius* and the Editors place it here (t) on purpose to Rail at *Eusebius*, as if he put out an *Arian* Forgery; whereas it is a great Truth, and *Constantine* may well be supposed to write thus, before he was rightly informed in the Case; therefore those Gentlemen do not hurt *Eusebius's* Reputation, but their own, in accusing him so falsely, upon the old Grudge of his not attesting their Forgeries, devised and defended for the Honour of the Roman Church.

§. 15. The Council of *Laodicea* (though it do not appear any Pope knew of it till after it was Risen) they resolve shall be held under some Pope; the Title saith, Under *Sylvester* (u); *Labbe's* Margen saith, Under *Liberius*, *An.* 364, or 357; or, Under *Damasus* 367: Whereas

Whereas in truth it was under no Pope, and being placed in the old Collections of Canons after those of *Antioch*, and also mentioning the *Photinians*, it must be held long after the *Nicene Council* (w): But it was falsely placed before the *Nicene Council* by *Baronius* (our Editor's main Guide) to secure the Book of *Judith* by the Council of *Nice's* Authority (x). And the Reasons given for this early placing it are very frivolous: For first, The softening of a Canon of *Neocaesarea* is no certain Mark of time. Secondly, This Council rejects *Judith* out of the Canon of Scripture, and so did the Council of *Nice* also; for though *S. Hierom*, when he had told us, *This Book is not of Authority sufficient to determine Controversies*; adds, *That the Nicene Synod is read, to have computed it among Holy Writings* (y). *S. Hierom* only means, They allowed it to be Read for Instruction, but did not count it Canonical; for doubtless he would not have rejected *Judith*, if that Council had received it into the Canon. And he saith elsewhere, *The Church indeed reads Judith, Tobit, and the Macchabees, but receives them not among Canonical Scriptures* (z); and again, *A man may receive this Book as he pleaseth* (a). Herein therefore the Council of *Laodicea* doth not contradict the Council of *Nice* at all, as these Notes falsely pretend. Thirdly, This Council is decreeing the same things which were decreed at *Nice*, without naming it, is no Argument it was held before that of *Nice*; nothing being more ordinary, than for later Councils to renew older Canons without citing the former Councils for them.

The Notes on the Second Canon at *Laodicea* (which supposes Penitents, to make their Confession by Prayer to God, and mentions no Priest) would willingly graft the use of their modern Sacramental Confession, to a Priest, upon this ancient Canon (b); but it rather confutes, than countenances that modern device. Their labouring to expunge the *Photinians* out of the *Seventh Canon*, since all the old Greek Copies have these words (c), is meerly to justify their false Date of this Council. The Anno-

(w) *Beveridg.*  
not. Tom. II.  
pag. 193.  
(x) *Richer. hist.*  
Conc. lib. I.  
cap. 3. pag. 128.

(y) *Hieron.*  
Ep. CXI.  
Tom. III. p. 34.

(z) *Id. Ep. 115.*  
*ibid. p. 39.*  
(a) *Idem Ep. 10.*  
Tom. I. pag. 95.

(b) *Lab. p. 1523.*  
*Bin pag. 248.*  
col. 2.  
(c) *Beveridg.*  
Not. Tom. II.  
p. 193.

(d) Lab. p. 1524.  
Bin. pag. 249.  
col. 1.

(e) Lab. & Bin.  
ibid.

(f) Lab. p. 1526.  
Bin. pag. 250.  
col. 1.

tator on the Fifteenth Canon confesseth, that *S. Paul Commands all the People to joyn in the Hymns, and that this Use continued to S. Hierom's time; yet he owns their pretended Apostolical Church hath altered this Primitive Custom grounded on Holy Scripture*; and that for very frivolous Reasons (d). But let it be observed, That this Canon forbids not the People to bear a part in the Church Service; but allows them not to begin, or bring in any Hymns into the Public Service. The Seventeenth Canon speaks of *the Assemblies of the Faithful* in two Latin Versions, and the Greek is *Συναγωγαι*; yet because the worst Latin Translation reads, *in Processionibus*; the Notes impertinently run out into a discourse of their Superstitious modern Processions; for any thing serves them for an occasion, to make their late Devices seem ancients than they are (e). The Thirty fourth Canon mentions and censures those, *who leaving the Martyrs of Christ, go to false Martyrs*; And the Fifty first Canon mentions *the Martyrs Feasts*: Upon which the Notes (f) most falsely infer, *That the Martyrs were then adored with Religious Worship*: But this is only his Invention. The Canon speaks not one word of Worshipping Martyrs; but only, whereas the Orthodox Christian Assemblies were generally in the Burial-places of true Martyrs, where they offered up Prayers to God: Some it seems began to make separate Meetings in Places dedicated to False Martyrs, and therefore the properest Note here would have been, to have set out the Sin of Schism, and the Pious Fraud (as they call it) of feigning false Martyrs, of which their Church is highly guilty. The Thirty fifth Canon expressly forbids *leaving the Church of God, and calling upon Angels*; which they say is an *bidden kind of Idolatry*, and *for-saking Christ the Son of God, to go after Idolatry*. And Theodoret, who lived soon after the true time of this Council, saith, *Those who were for Moses's Law, which was given by Angels, brought in the Worship of them; which Error reigned long in Phrygia and Pisidia; and therefore the Council of Laodicea, in Phrygia, did by a Law*



## Part II. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

77

*Law forbid the Praying to Angels* (g). Which Canon doth so evidently condemn the Roman Churches Prayers to the Angels as Idolatry, that the former Editors of the Councils impudently corrupted the Text of this Canon, and put in *Angulos*, for *Angelos* (h), as if the Council had only forbid Praying in private Corners; whereas not only the Greek, but the oldest Latin Copies, and *Theodoret*, have *Angels*: But our Editors and Annotator having *Baronius* for their Guide, venture to keep the true Reading [*Angels*] in the Text, and put [*Angles*] into the Margin, hoping by false Notes to ward off this severe Blow (i). And first, The Notes dare not produce the place of *Theodoret* at large; then they strive to blunder the Reader with a distinction of *Dulia* and *Latria*, which can signify nothing here, because the Canon and *Theodoret* both say, *It is Praying to Angels which is forbid*; and that the Romanists certainly do. Again, *Baronius* censures *Theodoret* for saying, *That such Heretics as were for Moses's Law, brought in ANGEL-Worship*: But why doth he not censure *S. Paul*, who saith, *That those who were Jewishly inclined, and observed differences of Meats, New-Moons and Sabbaths, were the Inventers of Angel-Worship* (k)? The Angelic-Heretics in *Epiphanius* and *S. Augustine*, who came in afterwards, did not (as the Notes represent them) say, *That Angels were to be worshiped with the Worship due to God alone*: Only as the Romanists now are, so they were inclined to Worship *Angels* (l); that is, by Praying to them. However, we Protestants say with *Theodoret*, *We neither give them Divine Worship, nor divide the Service due to the Divine Majesty, between them and the true God* (m): And when the Romanists can say this honestly, and leave off Praying to them, we will not tax them with this Canon. *Baronius* hath one Device more, viz. *That the Angels, which this Council says, must not be Worshiped, were not good Angels, but Devils and the Genii, adored by the Pagans*; For (saith he) *the former Canon receives the Worship of the true Martyrs, and rejects that of false*  
Mar-

(g) *Theodoret. in Coloss. cap. 2.*

(h) *Edit. Merlini, Pet. Crab. & Barth. Caramanz.*

(i) *Lab. p. 1526. Bin. pag. 250. col. 1.*

(k) *Coloss. II. ver. 16, 17, 18.*

(l) *Aug. de hæres. Tom. VI. pag. 4 m.*

(m) *Theod. de Curand. Græc. Off. Sermon. 3.*

*Martyrs.* To which I Answer, first, It is false (as was shewed) that the former Canon receives the Worship of any Martyrs, true or false. Secondly, Why doth not this Canon call these *Pseudo-Angels*, as the former called those it rejected, *Pseudo-Martyrs*, if the Prohibitions were of the same kind? Did ever any Christian call Devils, Angels, without some addition; as *Evil Angels*, *Apostate Angels*, &c? Besides, in that Age when this Council was held (according to *Baronius*) the worship of *Demons* and the Tutelar Spirits, was public, not secer Idolatry; so that it is manifest, this Canon speaks not to Pagans, but Heretical Christians. And *Theodoret* shews, That it was those Angels, who gave the Law of *Moses*, which were hereby forbid to be Prayed to; and I hope neither *Binius*, nor his Master, will say, these were Devils: Wherefore this Canon plainly saith, *Praying to good Angels*, (as They of Rome now do) is *Idolatry*.

To conclude, The Sixtieth Canon of this Council, is the most ancient Account of the Canon of Scripture, that ever was made by any Christian Synod, being the same which the Church of *England* holds at this day; for it leaves out all those Books of *Judith*, *Tobit*, *Wisdom*, &c. which we account not to be Canonical; but our Annotator finding so Primitive a Council contradicting their new *Trent* Canon, and not being able to reconcile the difference, passeth this remarkable Canon by, without any Note.

§. 16. The reproachful Obscurity of *Sylvester* in this time of Action, in all other Christian Churches, puts the Editors upon giving us an heap of Forgeries together, to colour over the Pope's doing nothing Remarkable for Nine or Ten years: First, We have an Epistle of the Primitive Church, and *Constantine's* Munificence (o): But *Gratian*, and the former Editors of Councils, cited this as a Decretal Epistle of *Melchisedech*, to prove the Pope's Supremacy, &c. whereas the Forgery is so gross, that our Annotator affirms it to be a Fiction

Fiction of *Isidore Mercator's*, patched up of Fragments stolen out of the History of the *Nicene Council*, the Council of *Chalcedon*, and *S. Gregory's 24th Epistle*, and wofully Mis-timed (p): Yet being used to cite such Forgeries, (after this Confession) he will not let it go without making some use of it; for he Notes, that *what is said here of Constantine's Donations to Melchiades and Sylvester, is very true, and may be firmly proved by Optatus Milevitanus*. Very strange! *Optatus* mentions no Donation of *Constantine* to either of these Popes, *Vid. supr. s. 6.* and therefore the Reader may note, That false and weak Inferences or Quotations from manifest Forgeries, are Firm Proofs with *Baronius* and *Binius*, when they make for the Roman Interest; but the best Canons of the most genuine Councils are of no value, when they make against it.

After this follows that odious Forgery, called *Constantine's* Donation, wherein he is pretended to make over to the Pope, the whole City of *Rome* and all the Western Empire, with all kind of Ensigns of Imperial Majesty, and all manner of Jurisdiction; which Ridiculous Fiction (*Naclerus* saith) *Antoninus* rejected in his Chronicle, because it is not extant in any ancient Author, but only in the *Decretals* (q). But our Editors print it without any Note of its being false; yea, with Notes upon it, to prove it either true or very probable (r). And *Baronius* introduces it with many Stories, to make all that concerns the Popes temporal Greatness credible to an easie Reader (s); yet at last, to secure their Retreat from so indefensible a Post, He and the Annotator make it a Fiction of the poor Greeks: I shall therefore, First, prove it a Forgery; and, Secondly, make it out, That not the Greeks, but the Pope's Creatures devised it. First, That it is a Fiction appears from divers Arguments: For, First, who can believe *Constantine*, so unjust, first, to give *Rome* and the Western Empire to the Pope, and then to one of his Sons? Or who can think the Pope so tame never to put in his Claim? Secondly, This Edit

(p) *Lab. p. 1530.**Bin. pag. 251.*

col. 2.

(q) *Nacler.**Chron. gen. XI.*

pag. 604.

(r) *Lab. p. 1534.**Bin. pag. 251.*

col. 2. &amp; p. 254.

col. 1.

(s) *Baron. An.*

324. §. 117.

is

is grounded on the idle Story of *Constantine's* Baptism by *Sylvester*, which out of *Sylvester's* Fabulous Acts is related at large in it; but those Acts being (as was shewed) a meer Forgery, this Edict must be so also. Thirdly, It represents *Constantine*, who was born and brought up under Christian Parents, and had settled Christianity before this, as a meer Heathen, till he met with *Sylvester* at this time. Fourthly, It pretends the whole Senate and all the Nobles joyned with the Emperor, to give the Pope this Power. But besides the folly of *Constantine's* delegating more Power than ever he himself had, it is most false to suppose, That the whole Senate at this time were Christians; for many of them continued Pagans long after *Constantine's* Death. *Baronius* indeed (out of *Sylvester's* Acts) affirms, *That none of the Senate was converted before the Year 324* (t). Forgetting that he had told us, *Divers Senators had given up their Names to Christ Twelve years before* (u); and that one or both of the Consuls were Christians two years before this (w). So ill a Memory had the great Cardinal, when his Cause obliged him to defend a Lye. Fifthly, It speaks of the Emperor's intending to build a City, and call it by his own Name, in the Province of *Bizantium*, and his Resolution to transfer his Empire thither; and yet before this, the Edict had reckoned up *Constantinople* by name, and *Hierusalem*, as two of the Five Patriarchates, and given *Rome* Jurisdiction over all the other Four. Lastly, It is Dated in the Fourth Consulship of *Constantine* with *Gallicanus*, whereas *Licinius* was his Colleague in his Fourth Consulship, which was in the Year of Christ 315, that is, Nine years before the time fixed by *Baronius* for this pretended Baptism; and that clearly shews the Story to be all Sham, as all modest and learned Men of the Roman Church do now acknowledge: But *Baronius*, and our Annotator, considering not barely the falshood of this Edict, (for that alone would not discourage them;) but observing also, that it destroys the pretended Divine Right of the Pope's  
Supre-

(t) *Baron. An.*  
324. §. 76.

(u) *Id. An.* 312.  
§. 75, & 76.

(w) *Id. An.* 322.  
§. 1.

Supremacy, grant it at last to be a Forgery, but say, It was devised by the Greeks. Secondly, Therefore I shall shew the Falshood of that Accusation: For, First, they charge *Balsamon* with publishing it; Now he did not write till *An. 1180*, yet the Notes out of *Baronius* do confess, that a Pope quoted it *An. 1054*, (that is, near an Hundred years before *Balsamon* was born) to justify his Superiority over the Greek Church; and therefore *Balsamon* was not the Inventer of it: Secondly, It doth the Greeks no good, for it gives the Pope power over all their Patriarchs, and reckons *Constantinople* as the last and lowest Patriarchate, so that the Forger could not come out of that Church. Thirdly, It is grounded on the fabulous Acts of *Sylvester*, writ in Latin, and feigned in the Western World; and its whole design is to advance the Pope above all Bishops, Kings, and Emperors; and therefore no doubt it was advanced by a Friend of the Popes. Fourthly, The Notes confess, *That a Pope first set up this Edict, to prove his Universal Supremacy*, (not considering with *Baronius*, it seems, that it weakened his Title) *and the grave and learned Men of the Roman Church received it as Authentick for many Ages after.* We add, That till the Reformation they cited it, and writ in defence of it; and though now their Point is gained they begin to renounce it, yet the Advantage that Church got by it, shews, that they were the Forgers of it; yea, it seems *Anno 1339* one *Johannes Diaconus*, a Member of the Roman Church, was thought to be the Author of it. Fifthly, Whoever considers how unwilling the Cardinal and our Annotator are to have it clearly rejected, will be convinced, that their Church gained by it, and consequently invented it. They labour to prove, *the Popes temporal Power granted hereby, is both probable and true* (x): And though they own the French Princes, *Pipin* and *Charles*, who gave many Cities and Countries to *S. Peter*, never mention this Edict; yet they argue from their calling those Gifts, *A restoring them to the Church*, that they had respect

(x) *Lab. p. 1539.*  
*Bin. pag. 254.*  
*col. 1.*

(y) *Lab. p. 1540.*  
*Bin. pag. 254.*  
*col. 2.*  
 (z) *Lab. p. 1541.*  
*Bin. pag. 255.*  
*col. 1.*

(a) *Lab. & Ein.*  
*ut supr.*  
*Baron. An. 324.*  
*§. 40.*

(b) *Aene. Sylv.*  
*dial. de Donat.*  
*Constantini.*

(c) *Baron.*  
*An. 324. §. 29,*  
*30, & 130.*  
*Bin. not. p. 260.*

(d) *Lab. Marg.*  
*pag. 1542.*

(e) *Bin. p. 260.*  
*col. 1.*

to *Constantine's Bounty* (y). These Authors also mention Pope *Adrian's* confirming this Edict, and quote the Book of *Constantine's* Munificence (shewed to be a Fable just now) to justify it (z). They also would make out what it saith of the Images of *Peter* and *Paul*, then kept at *Rome*, by *Eusebius*, but cite him falsely, leaving out the main part of his Testimony; viz. *That it was only some who had such Images, and that these imitated the Pagans herein*; from whence it will not follow, That eminent Christians then placed them in their Churches (a). In short, Though they dare not say it is true, yet they would not have it rejected as false, because it gives their admired Church so much Riches and Power; and therefore doubtless no Greeks, but some of their Church invented this most notorious Forgery: And *Aeneas Sylvius* observes, That it was warily done of the Popes, to let it be butly disputed how far this Edict was good in Law, that so the Edict it self might still be supposed valid (b), it being their Interest it should be thought so.

This feigned Donation is followed by a Roman Council under *Sylvester*, in the Preface whereof *Sylvester* is falsely pretended to have called the *Nicene* Council; and in the body of which there is a Canon, *That none must judge the Chief Seat; not the Emperor, nor Kings, nor Clergy, nor People*. For the sake of which two advantageous Fictions, *Baronius* and the Annotator, defend and justify this Synod (c); though the Title be ridiculous, the Style barbarous, and the Matter of it as void of Sense as it is of probability. *Labbe* indeed notes, *That the Condemning Photinus here shews, it was put together by an unskilful Hand* (d), and rejects it as a Forgery very justly: For *Photinus* (as the Notes confess) was not Condemned till long after (e); nor were there any Christian Kings, but *Constantine* the Emperor at that time. Besides, the Forger first says, *None of the Laity were present*; and yet in the next Page affirms, That *Calphurnius* (Præfect of the City) was there, and that *Constantine* and his Mother *Helena* subscribed



## Part II. Roman Forgeries in the Council.

83

subscribed it (f); yea, *Baronius* himself observes, That this Council mistakes the Custom of the Roman Church, where in that Age Presbyters use to sit in the presence of the Bishops; but in this Fiction, they are represented as standing with the Deacons (g). Moreover, it destroys the Donation (Lies seldom hanging together); for if *Constantine* had given the Pope such Supreme Power a few days before, what need was there for these Bishops to grant the same thing; or however, why do they not remember *Constantine's* late Gift? Lastly, *Arius* (who then gave so great Trouble to the Church) is not mentioned here; not (as *Baronius* guesses) because he was to be more solemnly Condemned at *Nice* the next year (h); but because the Forger had nothing in his Eye, but merely to set off the Grandeur of *Rome*.

(f) *Lab. p. 1547.*  
*Bin. pag. 256.*  
*col. 2.*  
 & *pag. 257.*  
*col. 2.*  
 (g) *Baron.*  
*An. 324. §. 124.*

(h) *Baron.*  
*An. 324. §. 27.*  
*Lab. p. 1555.*  
*Bin. pag. 260.*  
*col. 2.*  
*An. Dom. 325.*

§. 17. We are now come to the First and most famous General Council of *Nice*, wherein the worst and most dangerous of all Heresies was suppressed; and yet the pretended Judge of all Controversies, and Supreme Head of the Church, had so little share in this glorious Transaction, that it is very uncertain in what Popes time it was called: *Sozomen* and *Nicephorus* say, it was in the time of *Julius* (i); Others think it was in *Sylvester's* time; *Photius* affirms, it was in the times of both *Sylvester* and *Julius* (k), though unhappily Pope *Mark* was between them two: Yet this Council is introduced by a Preface *a la Mode a Rome*, styled, *The History of the Council of Nice* (l), wherein (as well as in the Notes and various Editions of this famous Council) all imaginable Artifice is used to abuse the Reader into a belief, That Pope *Sylvester* not only called this Council, and presided in it by his Legates; but also confirmed it by his sole Authority afterwards. For the clearer Confutation of which Falshoods, we will consider, First, The Authority which convened this Council. Secondly, The President of it, with the Order of Sitting in it, and Subscribing to it. Thirdly,

(i) *Sozom. hist.*  
*lib. 1. cap. 16.*  
*Niceph. lib. 8.*  
*cap. 14.*  
 (k) *Phot. de*  
*7. Synod.*  
 (l) *Lab. Tom. II.*  
*pag. 3.*  
*Bin. pag. 262.*

The Power which confirmed it. Fourthly, The number of the Canons. Fifthly, The true Sense of them. Sixthly, The Forgeries for Supremacy herein inserted. Seventhly, The corrupt Editions of the Council it self.

First, As to the Authority convening it. The Preface saith, Constantine *assembled it by Sylvester's Authority* (m): The Notes affirm, — *it was appointed by the Advice, Counsel, and Authority of Pope Sylvester*; and again, — *Pope Sylvester, by his Pontifical Authority, decreed the celebration of a General Council* (n). To prove these vain Brags, they cite *Ruffinus* (whose Version of this Council they reject;) yet he only saith, *That Constantine convened it by the Advice of the Bishops*: However, this is Advice, not Authority; and Advice of the Bishops in general, not of *Sylvester* in particular; and if any Bishops did give the Emperor particular Advice, it was those of *Alexandria* and *Constantinople*, not He of *Rome*. Secondly, They quote the Sixth General Council (held 350 years after this of *Nice*, and in other things rejected by the Romanists) which saith, — *this Council was called by Sylvester and Constantine*: But they quote falsely, for that Sixth Synod puts the Emperor's Name first (o); and though they are no Evidence against Authors living in the time of the *Nicene Council*; yet even this shews, they thought the Emperor's Authority was chiefest in this Matter. The Notes also cite the *Pontifical* (which they have so often rejected as Fabulous) and *Sozomen*, as if they said the same thing: But for *Sozomen*, he never names *Sylvester*; but saith, Pope *Julius* was absent by reason of his great Age; and the *Pontifical* only saith, *It was called by the Consent of Sylvester*; not by his Authority; and indeed it was called by the consent of all Orthodox Bishops: Wherefore there is no good Evidence, that the Pope did call it. But on the other side, All the Ecclesiastical Historians do agree, *That Constantine Convened it by his own Authority, and sent his Letters to Command the Bishops to meet at Nice* (p); and not one of them mentions

(m) Lab. p. 3. &  
B. n. pag. 252.

(n) Lab. p. 63. C.  
B. n. pag. 291.  
col. 1.

(o) Bin. Tom. III.  
par. 1. pag. 194.

(p) Euseb. vir.  
Constant. lib. 3.  
cap. 6.  
Socrat. lib. 1.  
cap. 8.  
Theod. lib. 1.  
cap. 7.  
Sozom. lib. 1:  
cap. 17.

tions *Sylveſter*, as having any hand in this Matter : Yea, (to put us out of all doubt) the very Council of *Nice* it ſelf (in their Synodal Epiſtle writ to *Alexandria*, and extant in theſe very Editors (q) ) expreſſly declares, (q) *Lab. p. 9. Bin. pag. 285. & Baron. An. 325. §. 117.* *That they were Convened by* Conſtantine's Command. Which clear and convincing Proofs, ſhew the Impudence, as well as the Falſhood of the Annaliſt and Annotator, to talk ſo confidently of the Pope's Authority in this Matter ; who, if he had (as they pretend) Convened this Council, ſhould have ſummoned more Weſtern Biſhops, of which there were ſo few in this Council, that it is plain, Either *Sylveſter* did not Summon them, or they did not obey his Summons.

Secondly, As to the Preſident of this Council, and the Order of Sitting in it, and Subſcribing to it: The Preface and Notes falſly affirm, *That Hoſius, Vitus, and Vincentius were all three the Pope's Legates, and Preſidents of this Council* (r) ; and vainly think, if it had not been ſo, it could not have been a General Council : But if this be neceſſary to the Being of a General Council, ſurely there is ſome good Evidence of it. Quite contrary ! The Preface to the *Sardican* Council is of the Editors, or their Friends making, and ſo is no Proof: *Arthanaſius* ſaith, *Hoſius was a Prince in the Synods* ; but not that he was Preſident of this Synod, or the Pope's Legate. *Cedrenus* and *Photius* are too late Authors to out-weigh more Ancient and Authentic Writers ; yet they do not ſay, (as the Notes pretend) *That Sylveſter, by his Legates, gave Authority to this Council* : Yea, *Photius* places the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* before *Sylveſter* and *Julius*, even when he is ſpeaking of the Chief Biſhops, who met at *Nice* ; and he is groſſly miſtaken alſo, becauſe neither of the Popes did meet there (s). *Socrates* only ſaith, *The Biſhop of Rome's Preſbyters were his Proxies, and preſent at this Council* (t) ; but hereby he excludes *Hoſius* (who was a Biſhop) from being a Legate, and doth not at all prove *Vitus* and *Vincentius* were Preſidents. *Sozomen* names not *Hoſius*, but theſe two Preſbyters as the Proxies of Pope *Julius* ; but reckons that Pope himſelf

(r) *Labbe p. 3, & 65.*

*Bin. pag. 263, & 291.*

(s) *Photii Noma- can. pag. 163.*

(t) *Socrat. lib. 1. cap. 5.*

(u) *Sozom. hist. lib. 1. cap. 16.*

(w) *Richer de Concil. gen. lib. 1. cap. 2. § 6.*

(x) *Id. ib. §. 8.*

(y) *Baron. An. 325. §. 20.*

(z) *Euseb. vit. Constant. lib. 3. cap. 10.*

(a) *Lab. pag. 67. Bin. pag. 292. col. 2.*

(b) *Baron. An. 325. §. 73.*

(c) *Richer. hist. Con. cap. 2 §. 2. 3. 4.*

(d) *Theodoret. apud Barou. An. 325. §. 54.*

(e) *Vid. Richer. hist. Concil. lib. 1. cap. 2. §. 8.*

(f) *Phot. lib. d. 7. Synod.*

himself in the fourth place (u). Though these Notes in citing *Sozomen* (according to their usual sincerity) place the Bishop of Rome first, and all the other Patriarchs after him. Finally, They cite the Subscriptions to prove, these Three were Legates and Presidents at Nice; but *Richerius* (a Learned Romanist) saith, *These Subscriptions are of as little Credit, as the Epistle to Sylvester* (w); and adds, *That the placing these Presbyters before the Bishops, is a plain Proof, That all these Subscriptions were invented in later Ages; because the Pope's Legates never did precede any of the Patriarchs, till the Council of Chalcedon* (x). As for *Hosius*, he had been the Emperor's Legate long before, and divers of the Ancients say, He was very Eminent in this Council; but not one of them affirms, that *Hosius was the Pope's Legate*: This is purely an Invention of *Baronius*; but he only proves it by Conjectures (y). The Truth is, *Constantine* himself was the President of this Council, and Sat on a Gilded Throne (not as the Preface saith falsely, *Below all the Bishops*; but) *Above all the Bishops*, as *Eusebius* an Eye-witness relates (z); and the Notes at last own, He sat in the Chief Place (a); yea, the Annalist confesseth, *He acted the part of a Moderator in it* (b). *Richerius* goes further, saying, *It is clear by undoubted Testimonies, that the Appointing and Convening of this Council depended on the Authority of Constantine, who was the President thereof* (c); and he blames *Baronius* and *Binius*, for wilfully mistaking the Pope's Consent (which was requisite, as he was Bishop of an Eminent Church) for his Authority, to which no Pope in that Age pretended. It is true, there were some Bishops, who were Chief among the Ecclesiastics in this Council: *Eusebius*, Bishop of *Antioch* sat uppermost on the Right-side, and opened the Synod with a Speech to *Constantine* (d): Hence some (and among the rest Pope *Felix*, in his Epistle to *Zeno*) affirm, He was President of this Council (e): Others say, *The Bishop of Alexandria presided*; and indeed all the Patriarchs present, Sat above all others of the Clergy (f); yet so, as they all gave place to the Emperor,

peror, when he came in. And for the Pope's Legates, *Baronius* and *Bellarmin* do contend in vain about the Places they had in this Council since no Ancient Author tells us, they Sat above the Chief of the Bishops: So that this also is a Forgery of the Papal Flatterers, to give Countenance to their Churches feigned Supremacy.

Thirdly, As to the Power which confirmed the Canons of this Council; the ancient Historians do suppose that *Constantine* gave these Decrees their binding Power, and Record his Letters, to injoin all to observe them (g). And *Eusebius* who was there, saith, that *The Emperor ratified the Decrees with his Seal* (h); But the Annalist and Annotator seek to efface this evidence, by Railing at *Eusebius*, and by devising many weak pretences, to persuade the Credulous, that Pope *Sylvester* confirmed this Council by his Authority; and both the Preface and Notes tell us, that this Synod writ a Letter to *Sylvester* for his confirmation, and that he called a Council at *Rome*; and writ back to Ratify what they had done (i): But whoever will but read these two Epistles, will find the Latin so Barbarous and the Sense so Intricate, that nothing is plain in them, but that they are Forged (k); and *Labbe's* Margin tells us they are Fictions, nor dare *Baronius* own them to be genuine (l); and though *Binius* cite them for evidence in his Notes, yet at some distance he tells us, *it is evident they are both Corrupted* (m); and again he says, *if they were not both extreme faulty and Commentitious, they might be Evidence in this case* (n): But *Richerius* is more Ingenuous, and declares, That *these Epistles are prodigiously false*, The Forger of them being so Ignorant as to call *Macarius*, (who was then Bishop of *Jerusalem*) Bishop of *Constantinople*: Yet our Annotator cites *Dionysius Exiguus* for a Witness of these Epistles; whereas *Richerius* shews, they were Forged by some Ignorant Monk long after *Dionysius* his time, who mentions not the Pope's confirming of these Canons; nor doth he remember these Epistles; but only saith it was agreed, *these Canons should be sent to Sylvester Bishop of Rome* (o).

The

(g) Vid *Socrat. Sozom. Theodoret. & Rufin.* ut supra.

(h) *Euseb. vit. Constant. lib. 1. cap. 37.*

(i) *Lab. p. 6. & pag. 77.*

*Bin. pag. 64. & pag. 299. col. 1.*

(k) *Lab p. 68. Bin. pag. 348. col. 1.*

(l) *Baron. An. 325. §. 37.*

(m) *Bin. p. 348. col. 1. marg.*

(n) *Idem p. 365. col. 1. not. ad. Concil. Rom.*

(o) *Richer. hist. Concil. lib. 1. cap. 2. §. 6.*

The Notes further urge, a Roman Council under Pope *Sylvester*, to prove his Confirming these Canons; but that Council is a confessed Forgery it self, and so proves nothing (p). Lastly, The Annotator here (and almost every where) cites *Socrates* his speaking of an Ecclesiastical Canon, that no Decrees of Councils should be valid without the consent of the Roman Bishop (q). But First, Consent is not Confirmation; It is the privilege of every Patriarch as well as of him of *Rome*, That a General Council cannot be held without every one of their consents; but this proves not their pretended sole and supreme Power of ratifying all Councils vested in the Pope: Besides, *Socrates* here only Historically relates what Pope *Julius* said in his own Case; and therefore the Testimony relies on *Julius* his Credit; and indeed that was a peculiar Case, wherein, when the Cause of *Athanasius* was referred by consent of all parties to *Julius* as Arbitrator, the *Arians* took it out of his Hands against *Athanasius* his Mind; and judged it in a Council, to which *Julius* was not at all summoned, which doubtless was very illegal and unjust: But yet none can tell, where this Ecclesiastical Canon was made, which the angry and injured Pope here cites; and therefore till it appear whence *Julius* had this Canon, we must be excused, if we give no great Deference to it; and unless they could prove it was Recorded before the *Nicene* Council, it is very impertinent to expect the *Nicene* Fathers should Govern their Actions by it. So that we conclude not *Sylvester*, but *Constantine* confirmed this Council.

*Conf. Great Hill. Lib. Tom. 1. p. 352. Bingham on the Apostol. Hist. p. 18. Howell's View of the Popes. p. 35. Sulliv. Medulla Patrum p. 110. 136p.*

(r) Lab. p. 71.  
Bingham. pag. 395.  
col. 2.

Fourthly, As to the number of the Canons the Annotator also notoriously prevaricates; He confesses that all the Greeks, and particularly *Theodoret* and *Ruffinus*, assert there were but Twenty Canons made there; yea, that the Sixth Council of *Carthage*, (within less than an Hundred years,) after a diligent search in the three Patriarchal Seats of *Alexandria*, *Antioch* and *Constantinople*, could find no more than Twenty Canons (r): But the Notes conceal *Gratian's* naming no more but Twenty Canons, and his saying, there are but only Twenty *Nicene* Canons to be found



found in the Roman Church (s). For all this the Annota- (s) *Gratian*.  
tor boldly tells us, *That the truer Opinion ; (or rather that* dist. 16. cap. 10.  
*which is most for the Pope's interest) is, that more than Twen-* & cap. 13.  
*ty Canons were made there :* But we will examine his and  
*Baronius's* reasons (r). First, They say there is no Decree (r) *Baron. An.*  
about *Easter* among the Twenty Canons: I reply, There is 325. §. 157. &c.  
a genuine Epistle of *Constantine's*, in which this mat-  
ter is determined with the reasons for it, which is bet-  
ter than a bare Law without Arguments, in a case which  
had been so much disputed (u); nor could they make (u) *Bin. p. 285.*  
any accurate Canon, about it till the exact time was & *Theod. lib. 1.*  
Calculated, which they referred (not to the Pope, but) cap. 9.  
to the Bishop of *Alexandria*. Secondly, The Notes say  
S. *Ambrose* mentions a Canon made at *Nice*, against  
*Bigamists* (w); but *Baronius* himself confesseth, that S. (w) *Ambros. ep.*  
*Ambrose* only saith, They treated of this matter, but 82. ad Episc.  
doth not affirm they made a Canon about it: Thirdly, *Vercel.*  
They plead, there was a Decree about the Canon of  
Scripture made at *Nice*, (which is not among these  
Twenty) because S. *Hierom* saith, *he had Read that the*  
*Nicene Fathers computed Judith, among the Books of Holy*  
*Scripture*. I reply—S. *Hierom* only saith *they computed*  
*it among Holy Writings*, that is, (as we shewed before  
§ 15.) *among Books to be Read for instruction, not to be*  
*quoted in Dispute :* For if S. *Hierom* had believed this  
Council did receive *Judith* for Canonical, he would  
not have counted it (as he doth) to be Apocryphal; So  
that this proves not that there were more Canons.  
Fourthly, The Notes affirm *there is no Canon now extant*  
*here*, against a Bishops choosing his Successor in his  
Life time; which S. *Augustine* saith was forbid in this  
Council (x); which is a gross Untruth, since the (x) *Augustin.*  
Eighth Canon forbids two Bishops should be in one Epist. 110.  
City; and the Notes own this was the very Canon (y) *Bin. Not.*  
meant by S. *Augustine*, in the next Leaf (y): *Liers* should pag. 296. col. 1.  
have better Memories: Fifthly, They say the third & p. 297. col. 2.  
Council of *Carthage* cites a Canon of *Nice*, forbidding (z) *Richer.*  
to receive the Sacrament after Dinner; but if the histor. Concil.  
place be considered (as *Richerius* notes (z)) that Coun- lib. 1. cap. 3.  
cil

cil only refers to a former *African* Synod, which had decreed this, and not to the Council of *Nice*. Sixthly, The Annotator speaks of a Canon about Appeals to *Rome*, cited out of this *Synod* in the Sixth Council of *Carthage*, but he was wiser than to tell us who cited this for a *Nicene* Canon; for it was Pope *Zosimus's* Legate cited it, and he was convicted of a notorious Falsification therein, as shall be shewed in due place. Seventhly, He saith there was a Canon made at *Nice*; but not to be found among the Twenty, *that a Cause tried in a lesser Synod, might be judged over again in a greater*; and for this he cites the Fourth Epistle of *Julius*; but in his Notes

(a) *Bin. Not. in.*  
*cp. Julij. pag.*  
*395. col. 2.*

on that Epistle (a), he confesseth this was no Canon made at *Nice*, but only it was matter of Fact; in that this great Synod did judge *Arius* over again, who had before been judged at *Alexandria*. Eightly, The Notes say, *Atticus, Bishop of Constantinople at Chalcedon, did affirm, that the Nicene Council agreed upon a Form of writing Communicatory Epistles, which is not among these Twenty Canons*: I reply, *Baronius* and he both own this Form was to be a Secret among the Bishops; and if it had been put into a Canon, Heretics might easily have counterfeited these Forms, and so the design had been spoiled (b). Lastly, the Annotator cites *Sozomen*,

(b) *Baron. An.*  
*325. §. 166. &*  
*Richer. lib. 1.*  
*cap. 3. §. 14.*  
*(c) Sozom. histor.*  
*lib. 3. cap. 19.*

to prove that the *Nicene* Council added to the *Gloria Patri* the later part, *As it was in the beginning, &c.* Whereas *Sozomen* (c) in that place only speaks of *such as praised God in Hymns, agreeing to the Faith delivered at Nice*, but mentions no Canon or Form of words agreed on at *Nice*, about these *Hymns*. So that after all this shuffling, it is very impertinent for this Annotator to brag, that it is manifest there were more than Twenty Canons made in this Council; and Nonsense to tell us, *that the Greeks who stily maintain there were but Twenty Canons, cannot deny but there were more than Twenty*: And for all his Confidence, neither he nor *Baronius* dare defend those Eighty Canons, which *Turrian* hath fathered on this Council; and therefore whatever is more than these twenty, or differing from them, must pass among the many Forgeries of the Roman Church

Fifthly,

## Part II. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

91

Fifthly, As to the Sense of those Canons, which oppose the Pope's Interest, the Notes use many Impositions in expounding them. The Third Canon forbids the Clergy to cohabit with Women taken into their Houses; unless they were so near of Kin, as to avoid Suspicion and Scandal: Which plainly supposes, that they might have Wives, because cohabiting with them, could give no Suspicion nor Scandal: And since the Canon names not *Wives*, who were the most likely to dwell with their Husbands, doubtless this Council did not suppose the cohabitation of the Clergy with their Wives to be unlawful. Yea, not only *Socrates* and *Sozomen* (d); but *Pisanus* and *Nauclerus*, later Romish Authors (e), relate the History of *Paphnutius* his Advice to the Council in this Point; upon which the latter saith, *The Nicene Fathers allowed Priests to have Wives, if they pleased*: Which full Evidence against their Churches practice doth so enrage *Baronius*, that he not only denies this well-attested History, but lays by the Character of an Historian, and falls (in his guessing-way) to dispute against this manifest Truth (f). And *Binius* in his Notes (g) out of him, saith, *This Canon expressly forbids Clergy men the Use of their Wives, after they were entred into Holy Orders*; rejects the History of *Paphnutius*, and gives *Socrates* and *Sozomen* the Lye: But we shall leave the Reader to judge, whether he will give more Credit to the Words of the Canon, and these Ancient impartial Historians; or to the Corrupt Paraphrase, and Impudent Assertions of these two notorious Sycophants, who have so often been proved to govern themselves, not by Truth, but by Interest and Design. The Sixth Canon reckons the Pope but Equal to other great Bishops, and limits his Jurisdiction; at which the Annalist and Annotator are much discomposed, and (by various Fictions and shuffling Pretences) labour to pervert the true Sense of this famous Canon. And first, They say, *The beginning of it (viz. The Roman Church hath always had the Primacy) is wanting* (h): Whereas no Authentic Edition ever had any such beginning.

(d) *Socrat. lib. 1.*

cap. 8.

*Sozom. lib. 1.*

cap. 22.

(e) *Pisanus ap.*

*Bin. pag. 343.*

col. 1.

*Naucier. Chron.*

pag. 606.

(f) *Baron. An.*

325. §. 148,

149, 150.

(g) *Lab. pag. 72.*

*Bin. pag. 296.*

col. 2.

(h) *Lab. & Bin.*

ut sup. not. in

Can. 6.

(i) *Beveridge*.  
Concil. Tom. II.  
pag. 50.

(k) *Lab.* p. 45.  
46.  
*Bin.* pag. 276.

(l) *Ricker*, hist.  
Concil. lib. 1.  
cap. 2. §. 11.

(m) *Lab.* p. 75. B.  
*Bin.* pag. 298.  
col. 1.

ginning. Dr. *Beveridge* gives us Eight several Versions, besides the Original Greek, which all want it (i); and it is impudently done of *Binius*, to cite *Alanus Copus*, saying, *That Dionysius Exiguus's Version had this beginning*; since that very Version is printed by *Binius* himself, without any such Preamble (k); but 'tis all one to him, true or false, in his Notes, he makes a foolish Paraphrase on this Forged Preface, about the Divine Right of the Pope to his Supremacy; whereas the plain Words of the genuine Canon shew, That this Council grounded the Jurisdiction of these great Bishops only upon *Ancient Custom* (l): Nor can it be gathered from this Canon, That the Bishop of *Rome* then had any Superiority over him of *Alexandria*; the one being allowed as much Power within his own Limits, as the other had in his. It is plain, The Great Bishops are all here declared to be Equal, without any Exception or *Salvo*, upon the Bishop of *Rome's* account; which would have been mentioned, as well as the Rights of the Metropolitan of *Cæsarea* are, when the Bishop of *Jerusalem's* Place is assigned in the Seventh Canon, if the Council of *Nice* had believed, *Rome* had any right to a Supremacy over all the rest. The Annotator is also angry at *Ruffinus*; and though upon the Fourteenth Canon he says, *Ruffinus set down the true authentic Canon* (m); yet because his Version of this Sixth Canon limits the Pope's Jurisdiction to the *Suburbicarian Regions*; He first falsely represents the Words of *Ruffinus*, adding to them, ——— which above all others are subject peculiarly to the Diocese of the Roman Church; and then Rails at the Version it self, as evil, erroneous, and proceeding from his Ignorance: But doubtless *Ruffinus*, who lived so near the time of this Council, and knew *Rome* and *Italy* so well, understood the Pope's Jurisdiction at that time, and the meaning of this Canon far better than *Binius*; and therefore *Baronius* (after he had condemned the Version) yet strives to accommodate it to their new Roman Sense. But there is full Evidence, that these *Suburbicarian Regions* were only those Provinces which

were

were under the *Præfett* of Rome; that is, some part of Italy, and some of the adjacent Islands; and these were all the Churches which were then under the Pope's Jurisdiction: As may appear by the great difficulty which the succeeding Bishops of Rome found in the following Ages, to bring *Milan, Aquileia, and Ravenna* (Churches in *Italy* it self) to be in subjection to them: So that the Pope was so far from having an Universal Supremacy then, that *Balsamon* is mistaken in thinking he was made Patriarch of all the Western Church; for the very Fifth Canon, which orders all Causes to be heard and finally ended in the same Province where they hapned, not only destroys Appeals to Rome, but shews that no Bishop did then pretend to so large a Jurisdiction. Again, these Notes frequently brag of that Version of this Canon, which the Pope's Legate cited at Chalcedon<sup>(n)</sup>; wherein the aforesaid forged Title of the Canon [*The Church of Rome hath always had the Primacy*] are quoted as part of the Canon it self: But the Acts of that Council of Chalcedon shew, That this Edition was discovered to be false by the Constantinopolitan Code, then produced: And if the Fathers there had believed this to be the true Reading, they would not immediately have contradicted the first famous General Council, by giving the Bishop of Constantinople equal Priviledges with him of Old Rome: So that their Quoting a false, baffled, and rejected Version of this Canon, rather pulls down, than supports their dear Supremacy; to maintain which they have nothing but Sophistry and Fraud, as the next Section will shew.

Sixthly, Therefore we will consider the Impositions and Fictions annexed to this Council, to give colour to their feigned Supremacy: And first, because *Eusebius* speaks little of the Popes, for he could not truly say much of them; *Baronius* and the Annotator invent all the Calumnies against him imaginable; and the former (though he have little true History in his Annals for Three hundred years together, which is not taken out of *Eusebius*) Rails at him most unjustly, as being

(n) Concil.  
Chalced.  
A. 451.

an

(o) *Baron.*  
An. 318. §. 46.  
An. 324. §. 136.  
§. 143, &c  
§. 152. item  
An. 325.  
§. 192. &c.  
(p) *Athan.*  
Apol. cont.  
*Arian.* p. 180.  
(q) *Socrat.* hist.  
lib. 1. cap. 3.  
(r) *Bin.* p. 313.  
col. 2.

(s) *Lab.* p. 287.  
*Bin.* pag. 326.  
col. 1, & 2.

(t) *Baron.* An.  
Dom. 336.

(u) *Bin.* p. 328.  
col. 2.

(w) *Bin.* p. 499.  
col. 1.

(x) *Lab.* p. 483.  
*Bin.* pag. 391.  
col. 1.

(y) *Bin.* p. 331.  
col. 1.

(z) *Lab.* p. 303.  
*Bin.* pag. 317.  
col. 2.

an *Arian*; a malicious, fraudulent, and partial Writer (o). And *Binius* treats this great Historian at the same rate: But *Athanasius* expressly saith, That *Eusebius* of *Cæsarea* subscribed the *Orthodox Faith* (p). *Socrates* affirms also, That he agreed to the Faith of the *Nicene Council* (q). *Pisanus*, his Greek Author of the History of this Council, brings in *Eusebius* disputing against the *Arians* (r): And *Valesius*, in his Life, clears him from this spiteful Accusation; which these Men invent merely to be Revenged on him, for not countenancing the Pope's Supremacy; which is not his Fault, but his Vertue, because there was no such thing pretended to in his days. Secondly, These Editors publish a Letter of *Athanasius* to Pope *Marcus*, with that Pope's Answer (s), among the Records of this Council; and the Annotator often cites them, to prove the Supremacy and Infallibility; because the Roman Church is here called, *The Mother and Head of all Churches*, and, *A Church which had never erred*; and the Pope is called, *Bishop of the Universal Church*; yet their being Forged is so notorious, that *Bellarmin*, *Possevin*, and *Baronius* (t) reject them. Thirdly, They likewise publish in these *Nicene Acts* an Epistle of Pope *Julius*, wherein divers Canons for the Primacy are Fathered on this great Council (u): And *Pisanus* is so bold, and so vain as to defend this to be genuine, by an Epistle of the *Egyptians* to Pope *Felix* (owned to be Forged (w)), and by other Decretal Epistles, as false as this, which he defends; but it is so manifest a Forgery, this of Pope *Julius*, that the Editors themselves afterward reject it (x). Fourthly, Whereas the Ninth Canon of *Chalcedon* allows the Clergy to complain to the Primare, or to the Bishop of the Royal City of *Constantinople*; Notes are put upon this to falsifie that Canon, which say, That *Constantinople* is here put for *Rome* (y). Fifthly, Here is a Canon called the Thirty ninth of *Nice*, which saith, *He that holds the See of Rome is the Head and Prince of all Patriarchs*; because he is first, as Peter, to whom power is given over all Christian Princes and People (z), which must be



a Forgery of some Roman Parasite, because it not only contradicts the Sixth Canon of the genuine Council of Nice, but the Eighth of these pretended Canons, which limits the Bishop of Rome's Jurisdiction to the Places near to him (a). However, the Editors say, (a) *Lab. p. 294. Bin. pag. 333. col. 1.* *Steuchus, Turrian, and Cope* cite it; and they print *Turrian's* Notes upon it, which affirm it to agree with the Sixth Canon of the true Edition; and would prove it genuine by no better Evidence, than a Forged Decretal of *Anacleus* (b). By which we see, the most apparent Falshoods shall be published and defended, if they do but promote the Supremacy.

Lastly, We will make some Remarks on the Corrupt Editions of this Council: First, That of *Alfonfus Pisanus* is so Fabulous, that *Labbé* for meer shame omits it (c); but *Binius* prints it at large, with all its Fictions and Impostures (d); of which *Richerius* gives this Character, (d) *Bin. p. 300. col. 1.* *By this History of Pisanus we may learn, not what the Council of Nice was, but what it should be to fit it for a Jesuits Palate; for he hath scraped together all the Falshoods and Forgeries he could find, for enlarging the number of the Canons* (e). But I must add, that there are divers Passages in this Edition, which will not serve the ends of the modern Roman Flatterers: For first, *Pisanus* his Greek Author highly extols *Eusebius* (f); for which the Jesuit corrects him with a Note in the Margin. Secondly, The Orthodox Bishop bids the Philosopher believe that which was written, but not to regard things unwritten; because the Faith is grounded on Holy Scripture (g): (g) *Bin. p. 316. col. 1.* Whereas the Margin cautions the Reader, not to think that this is spoken against Ecclesiastical Traditions, though it be levelled at them. Thirdly, *Hosius* doth not subscribe (as the Pope's Legates here do) for Pope Sylvester; wherefore this Compiler did not think him to be the Popes Legate (h). Fourthly, It is here said to have been declared at Nice, That every Bishop under God was the Head of his own Church (i). Fifthly, Here is printed that part of the African Bishop's Letter to Celestine, wherein they blame his Legate for falsely citing the

Nicene

- (k) *Bin. pag. 328.* *Nicene Canons* (k). So also the LXXX Canons were not invented by a Through-paced Friend to the Roman Modern Interest, and therefore probably *Baronius* will not defend them (l). The 8th Canon (as was noted) limits the Pope's Jurisdiction to such places as were near him: The 24th and 66th of these Canons clearly declare, that some Bishops had Wives(m), forbidding Bigamy, and compelling them to take their first Wife again. And there are other like Examples which are not worth setting down, because they are all forged in later times, as appears by their citing a fabulous Discourse out of the Life of *S. Anthony*, falsely ascribed to the great *Athanasius* (n), by their quoting a spurious Work under the name of *Dionysius Areopagita*, which was (as all agree) writ after the *Nicene Council* many years (o): By their giving the Patriarch of *Antioch* Jurisdiction over the Archbishop of *Cyprus*, who was always free from that subjection, as was declared long after in the Council of *Ephesus* (p). Finally, Though this *Pisanus* do impudently reject the true story of *Paphnutius* his advising to leave the Clergy at liberty to Marry; which History is in his Author, and in *Gelasius Cyzicenus* also: Yet he magnifies a ridiculous Fiction afterward of two Bishops, which signed the *Nicene Faith* after they were dead and buried (q). A Fable so gross, that *Baronius* rejects it, with a Note which I wish he had often remembred, viz. That it was not usual Among Christians to confirm the Faith by Miracles, which was attested by more firm Evidences of Holy Scripture (r). Secondly, *Turrian* Edition of this Council repeats all these LXXX Canons, and in his Preface and his Notes he vindicates them all; and yet the Tracts which he cites to prove these Canons genuine, are owned to be spurious by all modest Romanists, and his Arguments are so trifling they are not worth confuting. We will only note therefore, that the 7th and the 40th of these Canons require, that Synods shall be held twice a year, which (as *Turrian* confesseth) agrees not with the custom of the Roman Church (s): And his Notes say,
- the
- (l) *Baron. An. 325. §. 53.*
- (m) *Bin. p. 335. col. 2. & p. 341. col. 1.*
- (n) *Bin. p. 302. col. 2. Vid. Rivet. Crit. sacr. l. 3. cap. 4.*
- (o) *Bin. pag. 336. col. 2.*
- (p) *Bin. p. 337. col. 1. Vid. Concil. Ephesin. Act. 7.*
- (q) *Bin. p. 347. col. 2.*
- (r) *Baron. An. 325. §. 182.*
- (s) *Lab. p. 294. & pag. 303. Bin. pag. 353. col. 2. & 358. col. 1.*

the 72<sup>d</sup> Canon differs from the 131<sup>b</sup>, and the 73<sup>d</sup> Canon is contrary to the 49<sup>th</sup> (t); but he will rather suppose (t) *Lab. p. 315.* the Holy Nicene Fathers contradicted themselves, than *Bin. pag. 363.* own any of these Canons to be forged, because some *col. 1, & 2.* of them seem to favour the Pope's Supremacy. As to the Edition of *Gelasius Cyzicenus*, it is generally a very modest account of this Council, and hath not many Errors in it, but like all other ancient Authors it speaks very little of the Pope; for which Reason *Binius* claps it under Hatches, and will not produce it till the latter end of his Second Tome after the Council of *Epheus*, to convince us, That all Authors are valued or slighted merely as they promote or discourage the Usurpations of *Rome*.

§. 18. To all these Impostures, contrived to misrepresent this famous general Council, there is tacked a Third Council at *Rome* under *Sylvester* in the presence of *Constantine*, wherein that Pope with 275 Bishops are said to confirm the Nicene Council, and make two or three new Canons (u). But though it be certain and confessed by (u) *Lab. p. 412.* *Binius* and *Baronius*, that *Constantine* was not then at *Rome*, though the Style be barbarous, and the Matter *Baron. An. 325.* frivolous, and the thing be a manifest Forgery contrived §. 199. to carry on the grand Cheat of *Sylvester's* confirming the Council of *Nice*; yet *Baronius* and *Binius* (who confess the Title to be false) labour to prove this Synod to be true, though *Binius* be forced to justify it by the forged Letter of the Nicene Fathers to *Sylvester*, and his Answer to them, both which in the next Column he owns are false and feigned (w). And thus where the (w) *Bin. p. 365.* Supremacy is concern'd, one Forgery serves for the *col. 2 C* Evidence of another.

The Council at *Gangra* is genuine, and was an uncorrupted Remain of Primitive Antiquity, till it fell into the hands of these Editors, who have put the name of *Osius*, Bishop of *Corduba*, into the Title in their Latin Version; and though that Name be not found in the Original Greek printed over against it; yet from

O

this

- (x) *Lab.* p. 414. *Bin.* pag. 366. col. 1. this Fiction of their own (x) the Notes impudently say, *That this Synod was Convened by Sylvester's Authority, and from Osius his presence in it, Binius certainly gathers it was celebrated under this Pope*; but a little after he knows not in what year it was held; and *Baronius* treats of this Council *Anno* 361, that is, near 30 years after *Sylvester's* Death (y). They tell us that *Pope Symmachus* in his 6th Roman Council approves this Synod, but he mentions not *Osius*; however *Baronius* guesses, that the reason why *Symmachus* approved it was, *because Osius the Legate of the Apostolic See was there*; which groundless Conjecture and false Assertion, *Binius* in his Notes turns into a positive Affirmation, viz. That *Osius* was there as the Pope's Legate. As to the occasion of calling this Council of *Gangra*, it was to condemn one *Eustathius*, whom *Binius* owns to have been a great Favourer of Monkish life, and *Sozomen* saith, he was a Monk (z); yea, the Synodical Epistle describes him as one who despised Marriage, allowed not the administrations of Married Priests, who had a separate way of Worship, and a different garb from others, making his Followers to abstain from Flesh, profess Continency, and renounce Propriety (a); all which are the very Characters of a Monk of the Roman stamp; and therefore it is wonder that *Binius* should give *Sozomen* and himself the Lye, and say he was no propagator of Monkery, and that it cannot be proved that he was a Monk; yet at last he fancies *Eustathius* his Name was mistaken for *Eutachius* an *Armenian* Monk (b). All which Blunders are only designed to keep the Reader from observing, that a Monk was condemned for an Heretic, yea, and censured for holding those very Opinions, which now pass currant among the Romish Fryers For which end also in his Notes on the 4th Canon, he saith, *The Heretics* (that is, Protestants) *foolishly apply this Canon to condemn the Celibacy of the Clergy, whereas* (he saith) *it doth not concern Priests who have Wives, but such as had Wives* (c). But I doubt it will prove the Romanists are the Heretics here: For both this Canon, and
- (y) *Lab.* p. 427. &c. 428. *Bin.* pag. 371. col. 1. *Baron.* An. 361. § 44.
- (z) *Sozom.* lib. 3. cap. 13.
- (a) *Bin.* p. 367. &c.
- (b) *Lab.* p. 429. *Bin.* pag. 371. col. 2.
- (c) *Lab.* p. 430. *Bin.* p. 372. col. 2.

## Part II. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

99

and the Synodical Epistle ; have [ $\mu\alpha\upsilon\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ] which signifies a Priest who now hath a Wife ; even as [ $\pi\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \mu\alpha\upsilon\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ] 1 Cor. vii. 10. is those that have Wives , and are actually married ; and so the best Version of this Canon is *Presbyterum Conjugatum* : For by it all those are Anathematiz'd, who affirm, *That men should not Communicate, if a Married Priest say the Office* : That is, this Primitive Council Anathematizes the Modern Church of Rome , to hide the shame of which just Censure the Notes quarrel with Our preferring the Translation of their Friend *Dionysius* , who turns the word [ $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\upsilon\rho\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega\iota\varsigma$ ] *Ministrante* ; before those Versions which turn it by *Sacrificante* ; as if Protestants did this out of a design to blot out the Memorial of the unbloody Sacrifice (d) ; whereas that Greek word doth properly signify *Ministring and saying the Offices of the Church* , but no where is used properly for Sacrificing ; and it is apparent, that Protestants do most religiously believe the Sacrament to be an unbloody Sacrifice, and as such , do make it a Memorial of Christs one bloody Sacrifice upon the Cross.

(d) Lab. p. 431.  
Bm. pag. 372.  
col. 2.

The Notes also blame these *Eustathian* Heretics for *persuading the People to give them the dispensing of their Alms intended for the Poor , contrary (saith Binius) to the Apostles Doctrine and Constitution* (e). Yet thus the Roman Fryers do at this day , drawing the Peoples Alms to their Convents under pretence of being dispensers of them. The same Notes are mistaken in saying, *That the Manicheans were forbid by their Doctrine to give any Alms to the Poor* : For *S Augustine* (who knew those Heretics best) affirms, *That they only forbid their People , to give Meat or Fruits—to any Beggar who was not of their own Sect* (f). Lastly, whereas this Council condemns the *Eustathians* , for *abhorring the Assemblies and Divine Offices used in the places where the Martyrs were commemorated*, Can. ult. These Notes falsely pretend they were condemned, for *disapproving the Worship and Invocation of the holy Martyrs* (g) ; whereas it is plain by the Canon, that the Martyrs were only Commemorated, not Invoked nor Worshiped in those days ; and the expression

(e) Lab. & Bm.  
ut supra.

(f) Aug. de  
mor. Manich.  
lib. 2. Tom. I.  
pag. 177.

(g) Lab. p. 434.  
Bm. pag. 374.  
col. 1.

in this place, is only a Phrase to signifie the usual Assemblies of Orthodox Christians, which were then frequently held in the Burying places of the Martyrs, and these Heretics separated from those public Assemblies.

An.Dom. 335. The *Arians*, to revenge their Condemnation at *Nice*, falsely accuse *Athanasius* to the Emperour *Constantine*, who thereupon called a Council at *Tyre*, which these Editors intitle, *The Council of Tyre under Sylvester* (b). Yet all the Ancients agree the Emperour Called it, and their own Notes confess as much: Only they pretend, *He Called this Council contrary to custom and his duty*; but this is notoriously false, since *Constantine* had already called divers Councils, and particularly that of *Nice*. And as for Pope *Sylvester*, he is not once named in this Council at *Tyre*, which looks a little oddly upon the pretended Supremacy, that when the Catholic Cause lay at the stake, we never hear one word of the Roman Bishop, neither in this Council, nor in all the succeeding Letters and Councils relating to *Athanasius*, till that Cause was afterward brought before the Pope, as an Arbitrator chosen by both parties.

An.Dom. 336. §. 19. Pope *Marcus* succeeded *Sylvester*, and sat but eight Months; yet, that he might not seem to have done nothing, The Forgers have invented an Epistle from *Athanasius* to this Pope, desiring a true Copy of the *Nicene* Canons from *Rome* on pretence, that the *Arians* had burnt theirs at *Alexandria*: To which is annexed *Marcus* his Answer, who saith he had sent him 70 Canons. Now *Binius* hath often cited these Epistles, to prove the Popes Supremacy and Infallibility, and to shew there were more than twenty Canons made at *Nice*, yet here His Notes bring five substantial Reasons, to prove these Epistles forged; and *Labbé* notes, *These Wares of Ildore are justly suspected by Baronius, Bellarmine, and other skilful Catholics, nor doth Binius himself doubt of their being spurious* (i). Yea, it is remarkable, that this very *Binius* out of *Baronius* (k) here confesseth, *That he who Forged the Epistle of Boniface to Eulalius, devised also these*

(i) Lab. p. 469.  
& 472.

Bin. pag. 382.  
col. 2, &c.

(k) Baron. An.

336 §. 59, & 60.



## Part II. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

101

These two Epistles, to consult the Credit of Pope Zosimus and Pope Boniface, who had cited a Canon out of the Nicene Council, not found among the genuine 20 Canons. From which we may observe, First, that *Binus* will cite those things for the Supremacy, &c. which he knows to be forged. Secondly, That the great design of all these Forged Records of Antiquity was either to cover the faults, or consult the honour of the Roman Church, which seems to have both employed and encouraged the Authors of these Pious Frauds, because her Pretences could not be made out by any thing that was Authentic.

*Julius* succeeded *Marcus* in the same year, in whose Life the Pontifical mistakes the Consuls Names, and feigns he was banished Ten Months, which *Baronius* proves to have been impossible (1), He fills up this Popes story (according to his manner) with trifling matters, and omits the only remarkable thing in his Life, which was his concern in the Cause of *Athanasius*. In this Popes name several Epistles are published: The First from *Julius* to the Eastern Bishops may be proved fictitious, not only by the Confession of *Baronius* and other Learned Romanists (m), but by divers other Arguments. For is it probable, that *Julius* would Only be solicitous about his Supremacy when he writ to the *Arians*, and not once reprove them for their Heresie, nor their persecuting *Athanasius*? is it likely he should cite the Council of *Nice* falsely, and feign so many ancient Decrees about the Primacy of the Pope, and the Nullity of Councils not celebrated by his Authority? This Forger saith, *Julius* consented to the *Nicene* Council at the time of its celebration; but the Romanists agree that it was held in *Sylvesters* time. He imperiously forbids the Eastern Bishops to judge any Bishops without him, and falsely tells them, They all had received their Consecration from *Rome*, yea, with the fabulous Pontifical he mistakes the Consuls Name, and puts *Maximianus* for *Titianus*. Yet by this Forgery the Editors would prove, that more than twenty Canons were

(1) *Baron. An.*  
352. §. 2, & 3.

(m) *Lat. p. 475.*  
in *Marg.*  
*Bin. pag. 187.*  
col. 11.

- (n) *Lab. Marg.* were made at *Nice* (n), and (after *Baronius* had discarded it) *Binius* by frivolous Notes strives to justify it as speaking big for the Supremacy (o). Secondly, Here is the Eastern Bishops Answer to *Julius*, wherein though they call the Pope *Father*, which was the usual Title of Bishops of great Sees; yet they expressly deny his having any Authority over them, and affirm he ought to be subject to the Canons, as well as other Bishops: So that there is no reason for *Binius* his *Brag, Lo, how they own the Supremacy* (p)! For indeed they do not own it at all, and yet the substance of this Epistle is genuine, being found in *Secrates* and *Sozomen*. The third Epistle from *Julius* to the *Arians*, is owned by *Baronius* and others to be a Forgery (q); and *Binius* in his Notes upon it saith, *It is false, corrupted, and stolen out of divers Authors* (r), yet the same *Binius* infamously quotes it over and over for the Supremacy, the Nullity of Councils not called by the Pope, and the number of the *Nicene* Canons. The fourth Epistle of *Julius* comes not out of the *Vatican*, but was preserved in *Athanasius* his Apology, and is by all accounted genuine, being writ in an humble style, without any pretences to the Supremacy (s). And here the *Nicene* Canon (about the re-hearing in a New Synod, a Cause not well judged before) is rightly cited, without mention of any final Appeal to *Rome* (t); The power of all Bishops is supposed to be equal, and not any greater power to belong to him that is fixed in a greater City. Here *Julius* writes not his own Sense, but the Sense of the Bishops of *Italy*, who were assembled in a Synod at *Rome*, of which great City *Julius* being Bishop ought, by ancient custom, to publish the Decrees of such Councils as were held in or near that City (u); but *Binius* falsely infers from hence, *That it was an honour due to his place, to publish the Decrees made in all Synods*. And whereas, when any thing was under debate concerning *Alexandria* (the second Patriarchate) *Julius* saith, it was a Custom, to write to the Roman Bishop (who was the first Patriarch,) *Binius* stretcheth this and saith, *It was both*
- (n) *Lab. Marg.* pag. 477.  
*Bin.* pag. 385.  
 col. 1.  
 (o) *Lab.* p. 480.  
*Bin.* pag. 386.  
 col. 1.  
 (p) *Lab. Marg.* pag. 482.  
*Bin.* pag. 386.  
 col. 2.  
 (q) *Lab.* p. 483.  
*Bin.* pag. 387.  
 col. 2.  
 (r) *Bin.* p. 391.  
 col. 1.  
 (s) *Lab.* p. 494.  
*Bin.* pag. 391.  
 col. 1.  
 (t) *Lab.* p. 495.  
*Bin.* ut supr.  
 col. 2.  
 (u) *Lab.* p. 513.  
*Bin.* pag. 395.  
 col. 1.

both agreeable to the *Canons and Custom*, that no Bishop should be judged till the Popes definitive Sentence were heard (w). The last Epistle also is genuine, and writ in a modest style, owning that *Arbanasius* was not judged by the Pope alone, but by a Synod of Bishops, whose Judgment he supposes above his own (x), and by these two Epistles we may discern the Impostures of those other Epistles, which are Forged about this time in the Names of this and other Popes. The Decrees attributed to this Pope are not suitable to the Age, yet we may note, the third Decree forbids a man to Marry his deceased Brothers Wife, though his Brother had not known her: Which was shamefully broken by that Pope, who gave Licence to King *Henry* the 8th to marry his Brothers Wife, and this Decree justifies his Divorce (y).

After these Epistles follows a Roman Synod, wherein *Julius* with 117 Bishops confirm the *Nicene Council*; but *Labbé* saith, it is a hotch-potch made up out of many Authors, and put into the form of a Council by *Isidore* (z), and it is dated with the same mistaken Consuls, *Felician* and *Maximian*, with which *Julius* his entrance into the Pontifical, and all his Forged Epistles are dated (for his genuine Epistles have no date;) yet *Baronius* (a) and the Notes gravely dispute about the time of this Forged Council, and the Bishops which were said to be in it; meerly to perswade the Reader, that the *Nicene Council* needed the Pope's Confirmation; but since this Council is feigned, it can be no evidence: And therefore *Binius* gains nothing by alledging it in his Notes on the third Epistle, but only to shew us, that one falsehood is the fittest prop for another.

§.20. *Arbanasius* being restored to *Alexandria*, calls a Synod there of all the Bishops of his Province, of which only the Synodical Epistle is now extant, written as the Title declares, *To all the Catholic Bishops every where*; yet the Notes from *Baronius* (b) say, *It was writ particularly*

(w) Lab. p. 516.

Bin. pag. 396.

col. 1.

(x) Ep. 4. ap. Lab.

Bin. pag. 396.

col. 2.

(y) Lab. p. 525.

Bin. pag. 398.

col. 1.

(z) Lab. Marg.

pag. 527.

Bin. pag. 400.

col. 1.

(a) Baron. An.

337. §. 67.

(b) Baron. An.

339. §. 2. &amp;c.

§. 11.

cularly to Julius ; whereas the Body of the Epistle saith, *The Arians have written to the Roman Bishop, and perhaps (speaking to other Bishops) they have writ to you also* : So that this is a falshood devised for to make out the Supremacy, which is not countenanced by this Epistle, wherein we are told, that *Religion depends not on the greatness of any City* : Though the Notes say, *That Bishops had Honours and Jurisdiction given them, suiting to the dignity of the Secular Præfects of their several Cities*; and thence *Alexandria* was reckoned the second Patriarchate, and *Antioch* the third (c), it follows naturally, therefore *Rome was the first Patriarchate* : But this Inference they will not make : I shall only note that this Synod saith, *The lawful use of the Cup of the Lord was to make the People Drink* (d); from whence we gather, that the Roman Church (who denies the Cup to the People) doth a very unlawful thing, and leaves off the lawful use of the holy Chalice.

(c) *Lab. p. 534.*  
*Bin. pag. 401.*  
col. 2.

(d) *Lab. p. 547.*  
*Bin. pag. 404.*  
col. 2.

An. Dom. 341.  
(e) *Lab. p. 559.*  
*Bin. pag. 407.*

(f) *Lab. p. 588.*  
*Bin. p. 416.*  
col. 1.

(x) *Richer. Hist.*  
*Conc. lib. 1.*  
cap. 4.

(h) *Baron. An.*  
341. §. 4, & 5.

The Council of *Antioch*, is by the Editors said to be held under *Julius* (e), yet it was called by *Constantinus* on occasion of dedicating a new Church there; and the Notes say, the Emperour not only called it, but being present there, caused such Decrees as he pleased to pass in it (f); yea, it is evident they valued Pope *Julius* so little, that they judg'd quite otherwise than he had done in the case of *Athanasius*, and therefore the Romanists rail at this Synod as a Conventicle of *Arians*, and in the last Roman Edition (saith *Richerius* (g)) have left out these Canons as not favouring the practice of the Roman Court. However *Baronius* saith, Among 97 Bishops, only 36 were *Arians* (h); and the Canons made here are excellent Rules for Discipline, having been received into the Code of the Universal Church before *S. Chrysostom's* time, confirm'd by the Council of *Chalcedon*, allowed by *S. Hillary*, and (as *Gratian* saith) received by the Catholics; and the Learned *Richerius* hath fully answered all the Cavils of *Binius* and *Baronius*, by which they would invalidate them: So that we need only make some few Remarks

on

## Part II. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

105

on this Council, and so dismiss it. The 12<sup>th</sup> Canon Orders a Bishop who was deposed, to appeal to a Synod of Bishops, and allowed none to be restored, unless it were by a greater number of Bishops than had deposed him (i). But they exclaim against this as a device of the Arians, to take away that Apostolical and ancient Law and Custom of appealing to Rome, which (they say) was always observed till now: But hitherto they could never produce any such Law, nor prove any such Custom; nor did S.Cyrius ever appeal to Rome, but desired to be restored by a greater Synod, as this Canon requires (k), and when his Enemies made that impossible, then indeed he objected that this Canon was made by Arians; yet the Canon remained in force, and was generally received in that Age. Nor did the Sardican Council revoke it (as Binus falsely saith (l)): For though they put a new Complement on the Pope, yet they did not take away the ancient method of appealing from a lesser Synod to a greater. The second Canon decrees, That such as come to Church to hear part of the Service, and do not receive the Sacrament, shall be Excommunicated. This the Notes say was to condemn the old Arian Heretics (m); but it evidently condemns the new Roman Heretics, who since they exalted their Wafer into a God, expect the People should only gaze at, and adore it most part of the year, and excuse them, though they often go away without receiving it. The 25<sup>th</sup> Canon forbids Bishops to commit the Treasures and Fruits of the Church to their Kinsmen, Brethren and Sons: Upon which Binus hath no Note, knowing it reflected on the Roman Churches Custom, where the Popes generally give all they can to their scandalous Niposismo.

Next to this Council of Antioch, is placed a second Synod at Rome, under Pope Julius, in the Cause of Athanasius (n); but Baronius places it before that of Antioch, An. 340. §. 1. And though the Cardinal confesses, That Athanasius and his Enemies by consent had referred this matter to Julius his Arbitration, and that Athanasius came to Rome after this Reference was made; yet he

(i) Lab. p. 595.  
Bin. pag. 417.  
col. 2.

(k) Socraz.  
lib. 6. cap. 16.  
Vid. Bever. Con-  
cil. Tom. II.  
pag. 191.  
(l) Lab. p. 597.  
Bin. pag. 418.  
col. 2.  
Vid. Richer. ut  
supr.

(m) Lab. p. 596.  
Bin. pag. 418.  
col. 1.

(n) Lab. p. 604.  
Bin. pag. 419.  
col. 1.

(o) *Baron. An.*  
340. §. 2.

vainly remarks on this matter, in these words, *Behold, Reader, the ancient usage for injured Bishops, to come even out of the East to the Roman Bishop for redress* (o). But this is one of the first Instances, and was a meer Arbitration by consent; and the ancient Usage since the Emperours became Christians was to appeal to them, as these Parties had done, before it was referred to the Pope. In this Roman Council it is pretended *Athanasius* delivered his Creed; but the Acts of the Council being lost, and the Roman Archives being a repository neither safe nor creditable, we can have no Evidence from thence of the Truth and Antiquity of this excellent Composition. One thing however is remarkable, that *Baronius* and *Binius* charge the Greeks with taking away those words [*and the Son*] out of this Creed, and add, *that they falsely pretended, this was a late addition of the Latins* (p). Yet *Baronius* himself owns, that the Western Church added these words [*and the Son*] to the *Nicene* Creed, above an hundred years after (q); so that they accuse the poor Greeks for keeping the Creed, as *Athanasius* made it, and as their own Church used to recite the *Nicene* Creed for many years after.

(p) *Lab. p.* 60 r.  
*Bin. pag.* 420.  
col. 1.  
*Baron. An.* 340.  
§. 12.  
(q) *Baron. An.*  
447.

*An. Dom.* 347.

The year following *Julius* held a third Synod at *Rome*, and in it read the Letter of the Eastern Bishops, wherein they wonder he should cite them to *Rome*, and so value himself upon the greatness of his City, as on that account to take upon him to judge them concerning things which they had determined in their own Synods. Nor durst *Julius* challenge any Authority over them, by reason of the Eminence of his City (r): Only he pleads for *Athanasius*, who being Bishop of an Apostolical See, viz. *Alexandria*, ought not to have been condemned by them, till they had writ to all the Western Bishops, and especially to him as Bishop of the first See, that so all of them, (viz. in Council) might have determined the matter according to right (s). But *Baronius* and *Binius* turn this into their being obliged to write to the Pope, and to receive what he had defined: And *Binius* infers, from the

(r) *Baron. An.*  
341. §. 56, 57.

(s) *Id. An.* 342.  
§. 28, 30.



## Part II. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

107

the Popes writing this Synodical Letter from a Council held in his own City of Rome (though the Synod expressly command him to write the Epistle) *That in respect to the Pope, and according to ancient Custom, it was his right to publish Whatever was agreed on in Councils* (t). But such false Consequences from Premisses that will not bear them, only shew the Arguers partiality.

(t) Lab. p.607.  
Bin. pag. 420:  
col.2.

After this we have nothing remarkable, but a second Council at *Antioch*, held by the *Arians*, yet bearing this Title under *Julius* (u), wherein the *Arians* made a New Creed, and sent four Bishops to give *Constans* the Emperour and all the Western Bishops an account of their Faith, and they met these Legates in a Council at *Milain*; and though it doth not appear *Julius* was present, yet *Baronius* makes as if this Embassy from the East was sent to *Julius*, chiefly to desire Communion with him (w); and *Binius* saith, *They desired to be received into the Communion of the Roman Church* (x). But the ancient Historians assure us, they desired not the Communion of the Roman only; but of the whole Western Church, of which that was then esteemed no more than one eminent part.

(u) Lab. p.608.  
Bin. 420.col.2.

(w) Baron. An.  
344. §4.  
(x) Lab. p.614.  
Bin. pag. 422.  
col.1.

§. 21. The *Sardican* Synod, which saith some kind things of Rome, is prodigiously magnified by the Editors, who place an History before it, and partial Notes after it, which are full of Falsities and designed Misrepresentations: *Baronius* also spends one whole year in setting it off to the best advantage; but all their Frauds will be discovered, by considering, First, By whom it was called: Secondly, Who presided in it: Thirdly, Of what number of Bishops it consisted: And, Fourthly, What Authority the Canons of it have.

An.Dom. 347.  
*Conf. Basilie on the  
Fathers B. 1. Ch. 3. u.  
Geddes' Preface. l. 1.  
p. 3. f. 115 H. 2. f. 104  
1003 Clerg. 1. f. 157. (M. Klein)  
Ecc. Hist. Cent. 4. p. 2  
Ch. 2. § 8*

First, As to the Calling it, the Preface falsely states the occasion thereof: For it is plain *Atbanasius* did not (as that reports) leave the whole judgment of his Cause to the Pope (y); nor did he (as is there said) Fly to Rome, as the Mother of all Churches, and the Rock of Faith: This is the Prefacers meer Invention. For *Atbanasius* went to

(y) Lab. p.624.  
Bin. pag. 423.

Rome as to the place agreed on by both sides for Arbitrating this matter; and the other party so little valued the Pope's decision in his favour, that they would neither restore *Athanasius*, nor receive him into Communion upon it; which made *Julius* complain to the Emperour *Constans*, who writ to his Brother *Constantius* about it; but that Letter did not produce this Council (as the Preface fully sets out) but only procured a fruitless Embassy of three Eastern Bishops to Rome. It was the personal Addressees of *Athanasius* and *Paulus*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, to *Constans* (when they found the Pope had no power to restore them) which caused both the Emperours to give order for this Council to meet, as

(2.) *Sozom.* lib. 3.

cap. 19.

*Socrat.* lib. 2.

cap. 16.

*Theod.* lib. 2.

cap. 5.

(a) *Lab.* p. 670.

*Bin.* pag. 440.

(b) *Baron.* An.

347. §. 31.

(c) *Not. ad Con-*

*cil. Sardic.*

*Lab.* pag. 685.

*Bin.* pag. 445.

col. 1.

*Vid. Richer.*

*histor. Concil.*

lib. 1. cap. 3.

*Sozomen*, *Socrates* and *Theodoret* affirm (2.) And the Bishops in their Epistle do expressly say, *They were called together by the most Religious Emperours* (a): But *Baronius* fraudulently leaves out this beginning of the Bishops Letter (b); and the bold Writer of the Preface saith, *This Council was called by the Popes Authority*: And the Notes offer some Reasons to justify this Falshood, yea, they cite the afore-said Authors, who plainly declare it was called by both the Emperours, to prove, it was called by the Pope; but they offer nothing material to make this out. 'Tis true, *Socrates* saith, *Some absent Bishops complained of the shortness of time, and blamed Julius for it* (c); but that doth not prove the Council was called by his Authority, only it supposes, he might advise the Emperour to make them meet speedily; but still that is no sign of full power.

Secondly, As to the President of this Council, The Preface saith boldly, *That Hosius, Archidamus, and Philoxenus presided in the Name of Julius*. But first, it doth not appear that *Hosius* was the Popes Legate, only as an eminent Confessor he had a chief place in it; whence *Sozomen* saith, *Osus and Protogenes were chief of the Western Bishops here assembled* (d): That is, *Osus* as an ancient Confessor, and *Protogenes* as Bishop of *Sardinia*, where the Council was held; but as for *Archidamus* and *Philoxenus*, they are not in the Latin Copies of the Subscribers (e). And *Athanasius* only saith, *Julius sub-*  
scribed.

(a) *Sozom.* lib. 3.

cap. 11.

(e) *Lab.* p. 658.

*Bin.* pag. 436.

col. 1.

scribed by these two Presbyters; which shews, that *Hosius* was not the Popes Legate (for he subscribed in his own name) and that these Presbyters who were his Legates, were not Presidents of the Council.

Thirdly, They magnifie the number of Bishops also in this Synod, to make it look like a General Council; where accounts differ they take the largest (f), and falsly cite *Athanasius*, as if he said it consisted of 376 Bishops, and so exceeded the first Council of *Nice* (g). Whereas *Athanasius* expressly reckons only 170, who met at the City of *Sardica* (h); and when many of the Eastern Bishops withdrew, there were not one hundred left to pass the Decrees of this Council. 'Tis true, *Athanasius* affirms, that 344 Bishops signed the Decree to restore him; but many of these hands were got from Orthodox Bishops, who were not at the Council (i): So that this was never counted or called a General Council by any, but these partial Romanists; for though the Emperour seem to have designed it General at first (k), yet so few came to it, and they who came agreed so ill (the Eastern Bishops generally forsaking it) that it is called frequently, *A Council of the Western Church*, and so *Epiphanius* in *Baronius* describes it (l).

Fourthly, The little regard paid to its Canons afterwards shews it was no General Council. *Richerius*, a moderate and learned Romanist proves, That this Council was not extant in Greek in the time of *Dionysius Exiguus*, so that he and Pope *Leo* the 4th reckon it after all the Councils of Note: The Greeks received not its Canons into their Code, and Pope *Nicholas* Epistle shews, that the Eastern Church did not value its Authority, only the Popes esteemed it, because it seems to advance their power (m). The African Church of old valued this Council as little; for a Synod of Bishops there (among whom were *S. Augustine* and *Alypius*) were ignorant of any *Sardican* Council, but one held by the *Arians*. *Baronius* tries all his art to palliate this matter (n); but after all his Conjectures it is plain, it was of no repute in

(f) *Baron. An.*  
347. §. 3. 4.

(g) *Lab. p. 685.*  
*Bin pag. 446.*  
col. 1.

*Baron. ut sup.*  
§. 75.

(h) *Athanas.*  
*Epist. ad Soli-*  
*tar. p. 818.*

(i) *Idem Apol. 2.*  
p. 767. & 768.

(k) *Socras.*  
*lib. 2. cap. 16.*

(l) *Baron. An.*  
347. §. 42.

(m) *Richer. hist.*  
*Concil. lib. 1.*  
cap. 3.

(n) *Baron.*  
*An. 347. §. 73.*

in *Africa*, because when two Popes *Zosimus* and *Boniface* afterwards cited the Decrees of *Sardica* as Canons of *Nice*, the Fraud was discovered, and when they were found not to be *Nicene* Canons, They would not receive them as Canons of *Sardica*, but flatly rejected them; which shews, that these *African* Fathers did neither take this *Sardican* Synod for a General Council, nor for an Authentic Provincial Council: And therefore whatever is here said in favour of the Roman Church, is of no great weight. However the Champions of *Rome* magnifie the 4<sup>th</sup> Canon of this Council, where in case a Bishop judge that he is condemned unjustly, *Hosius* saith, *If it please you, let us honour the memory of Peter the Apostle, and let those who have judged such a Bishop write to Julius Bishop of Rome, that so (if need be) the Judgment may be reviewed by the Bishops of the Province, and he may appoint some to hear the Cause, &c.* Now here the Notes talk big, and claim a Supremacy and Appeals as due to the Pope by Divine Right (o): But *Richerius* well observes, *It is Nonsense, to ascribe that to a human Law and Privilege, or to the Decree of a Council, which was due before to the Pope by the Law of God (p).* And we add, that *Hosius* neither cites any Divine Law, nor any precedent Canon or Custom for this, but supposes it at the pleasure of this Synod to grant or deny *Julius* this privilege: And yet if it were an express Law, this being only a Western Synod, doth not bind the whole Catholic Church. Besides, it is not said, *The Criminal shall appeal to Rome, and have his Cause tried there*; but only, that the Pope (if need were) might order the Cause to be heard over again in the Province where it was first tried; and therefore *Julius* is only made a Judge of the necessity of a Re-hearing, not of the Cause it self, which according to the 5<sup>th</sup> Canon of *Nice* was to be decided in the Province where it was first moved. And this rather condemns than countenances the modern Popish way of Trying foreign Causes at *Rome* by Appeal. To this I will add an ancient Scholion on this Canon found in some old Copies,

(o) *Lab.* p. 690.  
& 691.

*Bin.* pag. 448.  
col. 1.

(p) *Richer. hist.*

*Con. lib. 1. cap. 3.*

## Part II. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

III

Copies: From this Canon the Roman Church is much exalted with Pride; and former evil Popes producing this as a Canon of Nice, were discovered by a Council at Carthage, as the Preface to that Council shews: But this Canon (whatever they pretend) gives no more power to Rome than other Canons, since it saith not absolutely, that any who is deposed any where shall have liberty to appeal to the Pope; for at that rate the Sardican Synod would contradict the General Councils; it speaks only of him who is deposed by the Neighbouring Bishops and those of his Province, and therefore doth not comprehend the Synod of the Primate Metropolitan, or Patriarch; so that if they be present, and the Sentence be not barely by the Neighbouring Bishops, the Pope may not re-hear it, as this Canon orders: And it only concerns those in the West, Hosius and the Makers of these Canons being of those parts; but in the East this Custom never was observed to this day (y).

I shall make one remark or two more, and so dismiss this Council. The Preface cites Sozomen, to prove, That Hosius and others writ to Julius to confirm these Canons: But Sozomen only saith, They writ to him, to satisfy him that they had not contradicted the Nicene Canons (z); and their Epistle (which calls Julius their Fellow-Minister) (a), desires him, to publish their Decrees, to those in Sicily, Sardinia and Italy, (which of old were Suburbicarian Regions,) but never speak of his confirming their Decrees (b). Yet in their Epistle to the Church of Alexandria, they pray them to give their Suffrage to the Councils determinations (c): Which, had it been writ to the Pope, would have made his Creatures sufficiently triumph. I observe also, that upon the mention of the Church of Thessalonica in the 20th Canon, the Notes pretend, that this Church had an especial regard then, because the Bishop of it was the Pope's Legate; yet the first proof they give, is, that Pope Leo made Anastasius of Thessalonica his Legate an hundred years after; and hence (they say) Bellarmine aptly proves the Popes Supremacy (d): But the Inferences are as ridiculous as they are false, and they get no advantage either to their Supremacy or Appeals by this Council.

§22. The

(y) Schol. ap.  
D. Bever. Conc.  
Tom. II. p. 199.

(z) Sozom. lib. 3.  
cap. 11.

Lab. p. 625.

Bin. pag. 424.

(a) Lab. p. 670.

Bin. pag. 440.

col. 1.

(b) Lab. p. 662.

Bin. pag. 437.

col. 2.

(c) Lab. p. 670.

Bin. pag. 439.

col. 2.

(d) Lab. p. 692.

Bin. pag. 448.

col. 2.

An Dom. 348.

(c) Lab. p. 713.  
Bin. pag. 546.  
col. 1.

§. 12. The first Council of *Carthage* was appointed to suppress that dangerous Sect of the Donatists; and though it bear the Title of *under Julius*, yet this pretended universal Monarch is not mentioned by the Council, or by any ancient Author, as having any hand in this great Work, which was managed by *Gratus* Bishop of *Carthage*, and by the Emperours Legates (e). In this Council were made fourteen excellent Canons, which possibly the Romanists may reject, because they never asked the Popes consent to hold this Council, nor desired his confirmation to their Canons; and whereas the Editors tell us, Pope *Leo* the 4th (who lived five hundred years after) approved of this Council, we must observe that the Catholic Church had put them into their Code, and received them for Authentic long before, without staying for any Approbation from the Bishop of *Rome*.

(f) Baron. An.  
359. §. 16.  
Lab. p. 721.  
Bin. pag. 459.  
col. 1.(g) Hosii Epist.  
ap. Baron. An.  
355. §. 661.

Soon after this, there was a Council at *Milan*, of which there was no mention, but only in the Synodical Letter of the Bishops met at *Ariminum*, An. 359. (f); who say, that the Presbyters of *Rome* were present at it; they say not, *Presidents of it*: And there it seems *Ursacius* and *Valens*, two *Arian* Heretics, abjured their Heresie, and recanted their false Evidence against *Athanasius*. And either before or after this Synod (it is not certain whether) they went to *Rome*, and in writing delivered their Recantation to Pope *Julius* (g), before whom they had falsely accused *Athanasius*, and who was the Arbitrator chosen to hear that Cause, and so not as Pope, but as a chosen Judge in that case, was fittest to receive these mens Confessions: Yet hence the Notes make this Inference, *That since this matter was greater, than that a Synod at Milan (though the Roman Presbyters were present) could dispatch it, and lest the ancient Custom of the Catholic Church should be broken, viz. for eminent Heretics to abjure their Heresies only at Rome, and be received into Communion by the Pope; they sent them so Julius, that having before him offered their Penitential Letter,*



## Part II. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

113

Letter, they might make their Confession, the whole Roman Church looking on. All which is their own Invention; for the Authors from whom alone they have the notice of this Council say nothing of this kind, and it is very certain that there was at this time, no custom at all for Heretics to abjure at *Rome*, more than at any other place, many Heretics being frequently reconciled at other Churches. There was also a peculiar reason why these two Heretics went thither, and it cannot be proved that this Council sent them; so that these are Forgeries, devised to support their dear Supremacy, and so we leave them: Only noting, That the Editors are not so happy in their Memory as their Invention; for the next Page shews us a Council at *Jerusalem*, wherein many Bishops (who had described the Condemnation of *Athanasius*, and therefore no doubt were *Arians*) repented and recanted, and so were restored to the Churches Communion, without the trouble of going to *Rome* on this Errand.

A Council at *Colen* follows next, which they say was in *Julius his time*, and under *Julius*; yet the Notes say, they know not the time when it was held, only the Bishops there assembled deposed a Bishop for Heresie by their own Authority, without staying for the Pope's Advice, though they were then about to send a Messenger to *Rome* to pray for them; so little was the Popes Consent thought needful in that Age; and perhaps it is in order to conceal this seeming neglect, that the Notes (b) (after they have approved far more impro- (h) *Bin. Not.*  
P. 463. col. 2.  
bable Stories, which make for the honour of their Church) reject the report of this Message to the Prince of the Apostles as fabulous, and we are not concerned to vindicate it.

The last Council which they stile under *Julius*, was at *Vasatis*, or *Bazas* in *France*; yet the Notes affirm, That *Nectarius* presided in it; the time of it very uncertain (i), and the Phrases used in the Canons of it, shew (i) *Lab. p. 728.*  
*Bin. pag. 464.*  
col. 1. & 2.  
it to be of much later date. Besides this Council saith, The Gloria-Patri was sung after the Psalms in all the

Q

Eastern

(k) Bin. Not.  
in Epist. Damasc.  
& Hieron.  
pag. 506. col. 1.

(l) Labb. p. 729.  
ad pag. 739.

*Eastern Churches*; but *Jo. Cassian*, who came out of the East in the next Century, saith, *He had never heard this Hymn sung after the Psalms in the Eastern Churches* (k): Wherefore it is probable this Council was celebrated after *Cassian's* time; when the Greek Churches had learned this Custom; and yet these Editors place it a whole Century too soon, because they would have us think that custom here mentioned, of *remembering the Pope in their daily Prayers*, was as ancient as the wrong date here assigned. In *Labbe's* Edition here is added an account (l) of three Councils against *Photinus*, on which we need make no Remarks.

An. Dom. 352.

(m) Not. ad  
7 Ep. Liber.  
Lab. pag. 751.  
Bin. pag. 470.  
col. 1.  
(n) Vid. Spalat.  
de rep. Eccl. l. 7.  
cap. 5.  
(o) Lab. p. 741.  
Bin. p. 465. E.  
(p) Lab. p. 743.  
Bin. pag. 466.  
col. 2.

§ 23. Pope *Liberius* succeeded *Julius*, whose Life with the Notes upon it are very diverting, if we observe the Shifts and Artifices used by the Roman Parasites to excuse him from Heresie. The Pontifical saith, *He was banished three years by Constantius, for not consenting to the Arians, in whose place Felix was Ordained, and he in a Council condemned Ursacius and Valens, two Arian Bishops, who in Revenge petitioned Constantius to revoke Liberius; and he being thus restored, consented to the Arians and the Emperour, so far as to persecute and Martyr the Catholics, and his Rival Felix being a Catholic, was deposed.* But this Fable is not fine enough for the Palates of *Baronius* and *Binius*, who are to dress a Story to make the Reader believe; that neither *Liberius* nor *Felix* erred in Faith while they were Popes. To confute which let it be considered, that *Binius* confesseth, *Liberius* consented to the depriving of *Athanasius*, admitted *Arians* to his Communion, and subscribed an *Arian Confession of Faith*; as *Athanasius*, *Hilary* and *Hierom*, witness (m); and there are Arguments unanswerable to prove, he was an *Arian* while he was Pope (n); yea, *Binius* in his own Notes twice confesseth, *That he unhappily fell* (o); and that, *he basely fell* (p). Yet to mince the matter, he adds, *That by his Fall he cast a vile Blot on his Life and Manners*; and the Notes on the *Sirmian Council* say, *By offending against the Confession of Faith,*

## Part II. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

115

Faith, and the Law of Justice, he cast a most base Blot on his Life and Manners (q). What can be more ridiculous! He erred in Faith, and subscribed the *Arian* Confession, therefore the blot was upon his Faith; this did not concern his Life and Manners. That Absurd Phrase is a meer blind to keep the Reader from discovering a Pope turning Heretic: To which end they impudently say, *It is a false Calumny of the Heretics to say, Liberius was infected with the Arian Heresie* (r). But I ask, Whether *Atbanasius*, *S. Hilary* and *S. Hierom* (who affirm this) were Heretics? Or was *Platina* an Heretic, who saith, *Liberius did in all things agree with the Heretics*: To which the same Forgers have added, [*As some would have it*;] but those are not *Photinus* words, who saith soon after, *He was of the same Opinion with the Arians* (s). And surely the Catholic People of *Rome* in his time took him for an *Arian*, and as such would have no communion with him, and therefore we conclude he was an *Arian*. As for *Felix*, who was put into his place, *Baronius* and *Binius* would excuse him by a false Latin Version of *Socrates*, saying, *He was addicted to the Arian Sect*; but the Original Greek expressly declares, *He was in Opinion an Arian* (t). And it is certain, *He was chosen by the Arians, and communicated with them, Ordaining Arians to be Priests*; and therefore the Catholic People at *Rome* avoided his communion, and *S. Hierom* saith, *He was an Arian*. As for the Story of his condemning *Ursacius* and *Valens*, two of that Sect, there is no better Authority for it, than the fabulous *Pontifical*. So that after all the devices of *Bellarmin*, *Baronius* and *Binius* (u), to save their Churches Infallibility, we have two Popes at once falling so notoriously into the *Arian* Heresie, that the Lay-people disowned their Communion: This is more than suspicion of Heresie in *S. Peter's* Chair, and proves, that their infallible Guides for some years were *Arian* Heretics.

For this *Liberius* divers Epistles are published, with a Preface before them, which saith, *Two of them were designed by the Arians* (w); yet these two are found in the

(q) Lab. p. 783.

Bin. pag. 479.

col. 2.

(r) Lab. p. 741.

Bin. pag. 465.

col. 2.

(s) Platin. in

vit. Liber. p. 50.

Eusebius Pref-

byter urbis

Rome cepit de-

clarare Libe-

rium Hæreti-

cum. Portitor.

Sarab. Aug. 14.

(t) T. Arian.

lib. 2. cap. 29.

(u) Lab. p. 742.

Bin. pag. 466.

col. 1, & 2.

(w) Lab. p. 744.

Bin. pag. 467.

col. 1.

Fragments of S. Hilary, among which it is not probable there should be any Fiction of the Arians. So that it is very likely these two Epistles are genuine, but rejected by these Sycophants of Rome, because they tell an ungrateful Truth, viz. That Liberius did condemn Athanasius soon after he was made Pope. And if we consider how inconstant he was, it is very probable that he might condemn Athanasius twice, first in the beginning of his Papacy, as is said in these two Epistles, of which he repented, and then writ that Tenth Epistle, to own he was in Communion with Athanasius, and to tell him, If he approved of his form of Faith, it would tend much to the settling of his Judgment (x), which is an odd Complement from an Infalible Head. Secondly, He condemned Athanasius after his Banishment, of which more shall be said hereafter: But as to the particular Epistles, we shall note; That in the first (which they say is genuine) Liberius with other Bishops petition Constantius, to order a Council to be held at Aquileia (y); by which we see the Pope had not then assumed the power of calling Councils. When he writ the 7th Epistle (which they grant also to be genuine) no doubt he was an Arian: For he calls the Arian Bishops, His most Beloved Brethren, and declares his Consent to their just condemning of Athanasius, together with his being in Communion with them, and his receiving their Sirmian Creed, as the Catholic Faith (z). So in the XIth Epistle (which is certainly genuine and recorded by Socrates (a),) the Notes confess, he was so easie, as to receive the Semi-Arians to Communion, and to commend their Faith, as the same which was decreed at Nice: But it is gross Flattery, to call this only, Being too easie; it was in plain terms, Being deceived, and erring in Matters of Faith; which spoils their Infalibility (b), as it also doth their Universal Supremacy; for Liberius in the same Epistle to call himself, Bishop of Italy (referring only to the Suburbicarian Regions) and saying, He was the meanest of Bishops, and rejoiced that those in the East did (not submit to him; but) agree with him in Matters of Faith. Wherefore the XIIth or (as Labbé calls it) the

XIVth

(x) Lab. p. 755.  
Bm. pag. 471.  
col. 1.

(y) Lab. p. 744.  
Bm. pag. 467.  
col. 1.

Vid item Ep. 2.

(z) Lab. p. 751.  
Bm. pag. 469.  
col. 2.

(a) Socrat. hist.  
lib. 4. cap. 11.

(b) Lab. p. 757.  
Bm. pag. 472.  
col. 1.

## Part II. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

117

XIVth Epistle, which is writ to all Bishops, is manifestly forged (c): And so are the two next, from *Liberius* to *Athanasius*, and from *Athanasius* to *Liberius*, as both *Labbe* and *Binius* confess (d); yet in one of these the Pope brags of his Authority over the Universal Church: But the Forger was so bad at Chronology, that while he strives to make this Pope look like an Orthodox Friend of *Athanasius*, he absurdly brings him in, even under *Julian* or *Valens* (in one of whose Reigns this Epistle was written,) threatening Offenders with the Emperours Indignation, with Deprivation, yea, with Proscription; Banishment and Stripes (e). I need not mention those Decrees which are attributed to *Liberius*, whose Style betrays them, and shews they belong to the later Ages, and are placed here by the Collectors, only to make them seem more ancient than really they are.

In *Liberius's* first year it is said, There was a Council called at Rome by this Pope, to clear *Athanasius* (f); yet being sensible that their Authority would signify very little, they all agreed to petition the Emperour for a Council to Meet at *Aquileia*, to confirm what they had done at Rome. Anno 355. there was a Council at *Milan*, the Editors call it, A General Council, because it was with *Constantius's* permission, called by *Liberius*, whose Legates also were present at it (g). But herein they grossly falsifie, for *Sozomen* declares, That *Constantius* summoned all the Bishops to *Milan* (h); and *Baronius* saith, The Emperour called them together (i). Therefore if this was a General Council, it was called by the Emperour, and not by the Pope: In the Notes on this Synod they say, *Constantius* being yet a Catechumen, ought not to be present at a lawful Council. But this is *Baronius's* device, to colour over the Forgery of *Constantine's* Baptism before the Council of *Nice*, there being no Canon forbidding a Catechumen to be present in a Council, or in a Church, except only while the Sacrament was celebrating; so that if *Constantius* had been bound by an Ecclesiastical Canon, there being no Canon to hinder his presence in this Council, *Baronius* assigns a wrong cause

(c) Ep. 14. Lab.

pag. 760.

Ep. 12. Bin.

pag. 472. col. 2.

(d) Lab. p. 763.

Bin. in Notis

pag. 474. col. 2.

(e) Lab. p. 767.

Bin. pag. 474.

col. 2.

(f) Lab. p. 769.

Bin. pag. 475.

col. 1.

(g) Lab. p. 772.

Bin. pag. 475.

col. 1.

(h) Sozom.

lib. 4. cap. 8.

Secrat. lib. 2.

cap. 29.

(i) Baron. An.

355. § 2.

(k) *Lab.* p. 773.(l) *Athanas.*  
*Epist. ad Solitar.*

cause of his absence. Again, the Notes do very falsely suppose, *That Felix, though chosen by the Arians, was a Catholic Pope* (k): For he was Ordained by three *Arian* Bishops at *Milan*, as *Athanasius* declares (l); and *Scrates*, as we noted before, saith, *He was in Opinion an Arian*. Nor is it probable, when the *Arians* had got *Liberius* banished, for not complying with them, they should chuse a Catholic and an Enemy into so eminent a See; or that the Catholic People of *Rome* should avoid the communion of *Felix*, if he were not an *Arian*. 'Tis true, *Sozomen* speaks of some who said, *He kept to the Nicene Faith, and was unblameable in Religion*; yet he adds, ——— *he was accused for ordaining Arians, and communicating with them* (m). But this bare Report, raised perhaps by the *Arians* (who still pretended to be Catholics, and hold the *Nicene Faith*) cannot outweigh such strong Reason and Matters of Fact, as are here alledged to prove *Felix*, not only a Schismatical, but also an Heretical Pope.

(m) *Sozom.*  
*lib. 4. cap. 10.*

The Dialogue between *Constantius* and Pope *Liberius* at *Milan*, (here published) shews, That at this time he refused either to condemn *Athanasius*, or communicate with the *Arians*, and was banished into *Thrace* for this refusal: But the Reader may justly wonder he should never mention his Supremacy and Universal Authority, when *Constantius* asked him, *If he were so considerable a part of the World, that he would alone stand for Athanasius*; and when he advised him, *to embrace the Communion of the Churches* (n), how properly might he have here told him, *he was Head of all Churches, and those who did not communicate with him were no Churches*? Again, Why doth this Pope offer to go to *Alexandria*, and hear *Athanasius's* cause there, which had been twice judged at *Rome*? Surely he knew nothing of these last and highest Appeals in all Causes: The Popes of after-Ages claimed this as a right of their See; yet it must be granted, that *Liberius* was ignorant of that privilege.

(n) *Lab.* p. 775.  
*Bin. p.* 478.  
*col. 1.*



§. 24. The Council at *Sirmium* was called by *Constantius*, and consisted of *Arian* Bishops, who though they condemned *Photinus* his gross Heresie, yet would not put the word *Consubstantial* into any of the three Creeds, which they here composed, however the Editors call it, *A General Council partly rejected*: Perhaps, because Pope *Liberius* approved it, who here openly fell into the *Arian* Heresie; and that, not by constraint (as the Notes pretend (o)): For out of his Banishment he writ to the Eastern Bishops, assuring them he had condemned *Athanasius*, and would communicate with them in their form of Faith, and therefore he desired them to intercede for his release and restitution to his Bishopric. The ambition of regaining which great place was the cause of his Fall (p), as *Baronius* confesseth; and though that Author had produced divers Ancient Writers expressly testifying, That he subscribed Heresie (q). Yet a little after he again denies, that *Liberius* was an Heretic; pretending, that he only sign'd the first Confession of *Sirmium*, which was not downright Heresie (r). Though elsewhere he saith, *Athanasius* rejected all these *Arian* Forms (which wanted, *Consubstantial*) as Heretical (s), and declares that the Catholic People of *Rome* esteemed *Liberius* to be an Heretic, and would not have Communion with him, for which he cruelly persecuted them. Nay, he brags of it as a singular Providence, that *Felix* (who was a Schismatical Pope in his Exile) upon *Liberius's* Fall, suddenly became a Catholic and a lawful Pope, which still supposes *Liberius* was an Heretic, as doth also *Baronius* his Fiction of *Liberius's* speedy Repentance, and *Felix* his dying soon after his Adversaries return to *Rome*: For the Writers of that Age say, *Felix* lived eight years after (t); and for *Liberius* his Repentance, though many Authors expressly speak of his falling into Heresie, none are very clear in his returning, or however, none suppose it to be so long before his Death, as *Baronius* doth; whose design in this History

An.Dom. 357.

(o) *Lab. p. 783. Bin. pag. 479. col. 2.*(p) *Baron. An. 357. §. 33, 34. & 35.*(q) *Baron. ibid. §. 32.*(r) *Id. ibid. §. 37.*(s) *Baron. An. 359. §. 10.*(t) *Marcelin. ad Faust. & Hieron. Chronic.*

(u) *Baron. An.*  
357. §. 59. —  
ad — §. 63.

(w) *Sozom.*  
lib. 4. cap. 17.

(x) *Id. cap. 18.*

(y) *Socrat. lib. 4.*  
cap. 11.

*Vid. Baron. An-*  
*dal. An. 362.*  
*pag. 58. &*  
*An. 371. p. 246.*

History is not to serve Truth, but to clear S. Peter's Chair from the imputation of Heresie; and therefore he makes this out chiefly by Conjectures (u). The testimonies of *Damasus* and *Siricius* being parties and partial for the honour of their own See, are no good Evidence if they did speak of his early Repentance; but *Damasus* only saith, *The Bishop of Rome did not consent to the Faith of Ariminum*: *Baronius* adds, *This was Liberius*. I reply, That *Damasus* was of *Felix* his party, before his own advancement to be Pope, and so it is more probable that he meant *Felix*. Again, the Catholic Bishop's Letter from *Ariminum* only says, *The Arian Decrees created discord at Rome* (w); that is, there were then two Factions there, one of which (and probably that of *Liberius*) did agree to these Decrees, the other rejected them. *Baronius* adds to the Bishops Letter, — *these Decrees created Factions, because the Pope of Rome opposed them*: But this will not clear *Liberius*, since both Factions were headed by a Pope. *Baronius* goes on to tell us, that *Sozomen* affirms, *Liberius was turned out of his Church, for not consenting to the Faith at Ariminum* (x). I Answer, *Sozomen* must be mistaken in this, unless we feign a double Exile of *Liberius*, which no good Author mentions, and which *Baronius* will not allow. As for the Epistle of *Liberius* to *Athanasius*, it was writ no doubt before he had condemned him, or else he ought to have confessed his Fault, as well as his Faith to that great Man. I grant *Socrates* doth say, *That Liberius required the Semi-Arians and Macedonians, to consent to the Nicene Faith in the time of Valens* (y); but this was Nine years after his return, and not long before his Death, yet then *Liberius* was imposed on in Matters of Faith by these Bishops, whom he calls *Orthodox*; for they were still Heretical, and did not heartily agree to the *Nicene Faith*, so that his *Infallibility* was deceived: And though S. *Ambrose* call *Liberius* [Of happy Memory] where he cites a Sermon of his; that is a Phrase which the Primitive Charity used of some Men not altogether *Orthodox* \*: But it is a great prejudice

judice to *Liberius* his Repentance, that though *Athanasius* speak of him as having been once his Friend, and report his Apostacy, yet he never mentions his turning Catholic again. Wherefore we conclude, that all these Fictions, and falsifying of Evidence and slight Conjectures in *Baronius* and the Notes, are intended only to blind the Reader, and hinder his finding out an Heretical Pope, whose Fall is clear, his continuance in his Heresie very probable, and his Repentance (if it be true) came too late to save his Churches Infallibility, though it might be soon enough to save his own Soul.

The Editors style the Council at *Ariminum*, *A Gene-* An.Dom. 359.  
*ral Council*, and yet dare not say, as usually, under *Libe-*  
*rius*, who had no hand in it, for it was called by the  
 Emperour *Constantius*, as all Writers agree (z); so that (z) *Sulpic.*  
 it seems there may be *A General approved Council* (as *Sever. histor.*  
 they style this (a)), which the Pope doth not call. lib.2.  
 Moreover, the Emperour in his first Epistle orders the (a) *Lab. p. 792.*  
 Bishops to send him their Decrees, that he might con- *Bin. pag. 482.*  
 firm them (b); and though *Baronius* saith this was done col. 1.  
 like an Heretical Emperour, yet the Orthodox Bishops *(b) Lab. p. 794.*  
 observed his Order, and call it, *Obeying the Command of Bin. pag. 482.*  
*God, and his Pious Edict* (c): Wherefore this General col.2.  
 Council was both called and confirmed by the Empe- (c) *Baron. An.*  
 roar. *§.15.*  
 Again, *Constantius* in his Epistle declares, *It was*  
*unreasonable to determine any thing in a Western Council*  
*against the Eastern Bishops.* Whence it appears, he  
 knew nothing of the Western Patriarchs claiming an  
 Universal Supremacy over all the Churches, both of the  
 East and West; and for this Reason *Baronius* leaves  
 this genuine Epistle (recorded in *S. Hilary's* Fragments)  
 out of his Annals: We have also noted before, that  
 though the Orthodox Bishops in this Council (who  
 must know the matter) say, *That Constantine was Bap-* (d) *Theod. lib.2.*  
*tized after the Council at Nice, and soon after his Baptism* cap. 19.  
*translated to his deserved Rest*; as the Ancient Historians *Sozom. lib.4.*  
 read that Passage, and the Sense of the place shews cap. 17. collac.  
 they could mean it of none but *Constantine* (d); yet cum *Baron. An.*  
 350. §.7.

R

*Baronius*

*Baronius* corrupts the Text, and reads *Constans* instead of *Constantine*, only to support the Fable of *Constantine's* being Baptized by *Sylvester* at *Rome*, and the Editors follow him in that gross Corruption: For they examine nothing which serves the Interest of *Rome*. As for the *Arian* Synods this year at *Seleucia* and *Constantinople*, I need make no Remarks on them, because the Pope is not named in them, and so there is no occasion for them to feign any thing. Only one Forgery of *Baronius* must not be passed over: That when *Cyrl* of *Hierusalem* was deposed by an *Arian* Synod, he is said to have appealed to greater Judges, and yet he never named the Pope; the reason of which (*Baronius* saith) was, because the True Pope *Liberius* was then in Banishment (e); but hath he not often asserted *Felix* was a Catholic, and if *Cyrl* had thought fit, might he not have appealed to him? But it is plain by *Socrates*, that *Cyrl* meant to appeal to the Emperour and his Delegates, as all injured Bishops in that Age had used to do.

(e) *Baron. An.*  
359. §. 65.

*An. Dom.* 362.

§. 25. Upon the restitution of *Athanasius* from his third Exile after the death of *George* the *Arian* Bishop, he called a Council of Bishops at *Alexandria*, for deciding some differences among the Catholics about the manner of explaining the *Trinity*, and to agree on what terms Recanting *Arians* were to be received into the Church. And though neither *Athanasius*, nor any ancient Historian take any notice of the Pope in this eminent Action; yet the Editors out of *Baronius* say, It was called by the Advice and Authority of *Liberius* (f); and to make out the notorious Fiction of this Popes calling this Orthodox Council (even while he was an *Arian*) the Notes affirm, *Eusebius* Bishop of *Vercelles* and *Lucifer Calaritanus*, as the Popes Legates were present at it; which they take out of *Baronius*, who had before told us, That *Lucifer Calaritanus* was at that time at *Antioch*, and sent two Deacons to *Alexandria* to subscribe for him; yea, this Synod writes their Synodical Letter to *Eusebius*,  
*Lucifer*.

(f) *Lab. p.* 809.  
*Bin. pag.* 487.  
col. 1.  
*Baron. An.* 362.  
pag. 73.

*Lucifer* and other Bishops, which plainly shews they were absent; though it seems by *Ruffinus*, that *Eusebius* came afterwards, and subscribed to what had been agreed in the Council, and was by the Authority of this Council (not of the Pope) sent into the East to procure peace among those Churches: Nor have they any one Author to prove either he or *Lucifer* were the Pope's Legates, nor any reason, but because they were employed in great Actions, though in that Age ('tis plain) the Popes were little concerned in any eminent business. Moreover, they bring in a Fragment of an Epistle, writ (according to the Ancient Custom) by *Liberius* at his Entrance into the See of *Rome*, to shew his Faith to *Athanasius*, as if it were written now, merely to impose on the Reader a false Notion of his being at this time Orthodox, and concerned in this Synod. They also cite another Epistle of *Athanasius*, to certify *Liberius* what was done here; but that Epistle is no where extant in *Athanasius's* Works, but is cited out of the Acts of the second *Nicene* Council, where there are more Forgeries than genuine Tracts quoted; and besides, the Epistle is directed not to the Pope, but to one *Ruffinianus*, and only mentions the Roman Churches approving what was done here; but the Epistle being suspicious, it is no good Evidence, and we conclude with *Nazianzen*, That *Athanasius* in this Synod gave Laws to the whole World (g): And Pope *Liberius* had no hand in it. (g) *Baron. An.* 362.

Tom. IV. p. 66.

About this time there were divers Councils called in *France* by *S. Hilary* Bishop of *Poitiers*, and the Catholic Faith was settled in them, one of which was held at *Paris*, and the *Synodical Epistle* is extant (h); yet the Pope is never named in it. Nor yet in that Orthodox Synod at *Alexandria*, wherein *Athanasius* and his Suffragan Bishops presented a Confession of their Faith to *Jovian*, then newly made Emperour (i), which shews, that *Liberius* either was an Heretic at this time, or else that he was very inconsiderable: So that it is a strange Arrogance in the Editors to say, that the Second Council

(h) *Lab. p. 821.*

*Bin. pag. 490.*

col. 1.

(i) *Lab. p. 823.*

*Bin. pag. 490.*

col. 2.

(k) *Lab. p. 826. at Antioch was under Liberius (k), when the very*  
*Ein. p. 491. Notes say, it was called together by Meletius, and ob-*  
*col. 1. serve, that many Arian Bishops did there recant their*  
*Heretic; a thing, which a little before they pretended*  
*could be done no where but at Rome, in the Popes*  
*Presence.*

An. Dom. 365. Upon *Valentinian's* advancement to the Empire, the  
 Eastern Bishops petition him to call a Council, and he  
 (being then very busie) told them, they might call it  
 where they pleased: Which the Editors pretend *was a*  
*declining to meddle in Church Affairs, being a Lay-man:*  
 But the Bishops Petition, and his giving them liberty,  
 shews, that *the right of calling Councils was in him,* and  
 so was also the confirming them, as appears from *the*  
*Bishops sending the Acts of this Council (at Lampfacus) to*  
 the Emperor Valens to be confirmed (l). The same Bishops  
 also sent their Legates with Letters to the Western  
 Bishops, and particularly to *Liberius Bishop of Rome,*  
 hoping *Valentinian* the other Emperor had been in that  
 City; but he being absent, these Legates, perswaded  
*Liberius* they were Orthodox; upon which he writ  
 back Letters in his own Name, and in the Name of the  
 other Western Bishops, to own them for good Catho-  
 lics (m). Whence we may note, First, That the Eastern

(m) *Socrat. hist.*  
*lib. 4. cap. 11.*

(n) *Ep. 11.*  
*Liberius ap. Bin.*  
*p. 472.*  
*Baron. An. 365.*  
*pag. 153.*

(o) *Socrat. ut*  
*supr.*

Bishop's Letter styles the Pope no more but *Colleague* and  
*Brother.* Secondly, That *Liberius* calls himself only  
 Bishop of *Italy, Liberius Ep. Italiae, & alii Occidentis*  
*Episcopi:* But *Baronius* alters the Pointing, *Liberius Epi-*  
*scopus, Italiae & alii, &c.* by that Trick, hoping to con-  
 ceal this mean Title (n). Thirdly, The Pope here  
 saith, *He was the least of all Bishops,* and was glad their  
 Opinion agreed with his and the rest of the Western  
 Bishops. Fourthly, Yet after all these very Eastern  
 Bishops were of the *Macedonian party,* as the Title of  
 their Letter in *Socrates* shews (o). *Baronius* indeed  
 leaves these words out of the Title, but he confesses  
 they were *Semi-Arians:* So that the Popes Infallibility,  
 (as being imposed on by Heretics in Matters of Faith)  
 loses more by this Embassy, than his Supremacy gains  
 by



by it, because the Legates were not sent to him alone, but to all the Western Bishops. Fifthly, The Notes on this Council (p) feign, that besides these Communicatory Letters, *Liberius* writ other Letters, Commanding that ejected Bishops should be restored by the Apostolic Authority: But this is one of *Baronius* his Forgeries (q). For *S. Basil*, and also *Sozomen*, cited by the Notes on the Council of *Tyana* (r), mention not the Legates shewing any other Letters at their return into the East, but only the Communicatory Letters; and since it appeared by them, that the Western Bishops judged them Orthodox, their Eastern Brethren did restore them: And so also these Legates got the approbation of a Council in *Sicily*, as they were returning home; for the *Sicilian* Bishops by mistake took them for Orthodox, when they saw the rest of the Western Bishops owned their Communion with them, and so approved their Confession of Faith; and therefore it is very impertinent in the Notes to say on this occasion (s), That the Authority of the Pope was so great, that if he admitted even suspected Heretics to his Communion, none presumed to reject them. Whereas we know that afterwards, the People of *Rome* rejected even the Pope himself, for communicating with *Semi-Arians*.

The next thing which occurs is a Synod in *Illyricum*, Convened at the request of *Eusebius* Bishop of *Sebastia*, one of the Eastern Legates, who (while his Fellows stayed at *Rome*) went into that Country, and prevailed with the Bishops assembled there, to send *Elpidius* a Brother and Colleague of their own, with a Synodical Letter to the Eastern Bishops; declaring, they would communicate with them, if their Faith was the same with that of *Nice*. Now though this Synod do not mention the Pope, yet *Baronius* and the Notes feign, That *Elpidius* was the Pope's Legate (t); whereas the Synod, the Emperours Letter, and *Theodoret* (from whom this Story is taken) mention *Elpidius* only as a Messenger sent from this Council.

When

(p) *Lab.* p. 830.  
*Bin.* pag. 492.  
 col. 1.  
 (q) *Baron. An.*  
 365. pag. 154.

(r) *Lab.* p. 836.  
*Bin.* pag. 494.  
 col. 1.

(s) *Concil.*  
*Sicilie, Lab.* 86.  
*Bin.* ut supr.

(t) *Lab.* p. 832.  
*Bin.* pag. 493.  
*Baron. An.* 365.

(u) Lab. p. 836.  
Bin. pag. 494.  
col. 1.

When these Eastern Legates returned home, there was a Council called at *Tyana* in *Cappadocia* (u), wherein they shewed the Communicatory Letters which they had fraudulently obtained in the West; upon which Letters, those who had been ejected as Heretics, and particularly *Eustathius* of *Sebastia*, were restored to their Sees; but neither *Sozomen* nor *S. Basil* say, this was done by any special Letters of *Liberius*, or by any Command of his; yet if it had been so, this would spoil this Popes Infallibility, it being certain these restored Bishops were Heretics, who *Liberius*, poor Man! thought to be good Catholics, and he hath the more to answer for, if this were done not by his Consent alone, but by his Command also.

After this we have the Life of Pope *Felix*, about whom they differ so much, that nothing is plain in his Story, but this, that little of him is certainly known. The *Pontifical* in *Liberius* Life saith, He died in peace; but here it saith, *He was Martyred by Constantius, for declaring him an Heretic, and one who was rebaptized by Eusebius of Nicomedia*: Yet *Constantius* was not Baptized at all till after *Felix* his pretended Martyrdom, and he was Baptized then (not by *Eusebius*, but) by one *Euzoios*. Again, The *Pontifical* allows him but to sit *One year and three months*, and the Notes say, *This is right, computing from Liberius Fall to his Return*; which (as *Sozomen* affirms) *was but little before Felix his Death* (w): Whereas these very Notes tell us, a little before, that *Liberius was above two years in Exile* (x); therefore if he lived but a small time after *Liberius's* return, he must sit above two years: But *Marcellinus* (who writ in that Age) tells us, *Felix lived eight years after Liberius was restored*; Which *Baronius* and the Notes would conceal, to hide the Scandal that their Church must get by a long Schism, and by an Heretical Pope, of whom they will needs make a Martyr, only upon the Credit of the *Pontifical*, and a modern fallacious Inscription, pretended to be found at *Rome* many Ages after, belonging to some *Felix*, but which of them they know not.

(w) Lab. p. 843.  
Bin. pag. 490.  
col. 2.  
(x) Lab. p. 742.  
Bin. pag. 466.  
col. 1.

The

The Epistles ascribed to this Pope contain so many and so gross Untruths, that *Labbe* notes, *They are discarded by Baronius and other Learned Men, as Isidore Wares* (y); adding, That the third Epistle was stolen from Pope *Martin* the First, in his *Lateran Council* (z). And though *Binius* very often cite the two first Epistles, yet in his Notes on them he owns, they are of no credit (a): For they Forge many Canons as made at *Nice*, and tell that idle story of the true Copies of the *Nicene* Canons being burnt by the *Arians* (b). But it is certain the Forger of these Epistles was a Creature of the Popes, because the Inscriptions of them are stuffed with false and flattering Titles, and the Body of them nauseously and ridiculously press the Supremacy, and the Universal Empire of the Roman Church.

(y) *Lab. Marg.*  
p. 844. & 849.  
(z) *Id. Marg.*  
pag. 856.  
(a) *Lab.* p. 849.  
*Bin.* pag. 499.  
col. 1.  
(b) *Richer. hist.*  
*Con lib. 1. cap. 1.*  
§. 9.

§. 26. The entrance of *Damasus* into the Papacy was not without Blood, for the People were divided, and some standing for *Damasus*, others for *Ursicinus*, *Damasus* his Party being stronger, slew many of their Adversaries in a Church, as all the Writers of that Age testify (c); and though *Ammianus* be a Pagan Historian, yet it is very probable which he writes, that it was not Zeal, but the ambition of living high and great, that made Men contend so fiercely for the Papacy; for *S. Basil* himself about this time taxes the Roman Church with Pride; and *S. Hierom*, the great Friend of that Church, often reflects upon the pomp and luxury of the Clergy there: So that the Notes on *Damasus* his Life do but glory in their Churches shame, when from these Authors they boast of the Magnificence and Majesty of the Papacy (d). The Fabulous Pontifical was for many Ages pretended to be writ by this *Damasus*, and he who forged the Decretal Epistles, invented one to *Aurelius* Bishop of *Carthage* (e); wherein *Damasus* is feigned to send him (at his Request) all the Epistles writ by the Popes from *S. Peter*, to his time, and this of old was the Preface to the Decretal Epistles; but the Forgery is so gross that *Binius* rejects it.

An. Dom. 367.  
(c) *Am. Marcell.*  
lib. 17.  
*Ruffin. lib. 2.*  
cap. 10.  
*Hieron. in Chron.*  
(d) *Lab. p. 860.*  
*Bin. pag. 503.*  
col. 2.  
(e) *Lab. p. 862.*  
*Bin. pag. 503.*  
col. 2.

it, and if his affection for the Papacy had not biased him, he would also have rejected all the Epistles, which are as errant Forgeries as this Preface. The first and second Epistles written in *Damasus* his Name to *Paulinus*, and the Eastern Bishops, are suspicious. The third Epistle of *Damasus* to *Hierom* is evidently Forged by some illiterate Monk; but *S. Hierom's* Answer seems to be genuine; yet the Notes reject it. (f) for no other reason, but because it truly supposes the Pope and his Clergy were so ignorant, as to need *S. Hierom's* help to make them understand the Psalms, and affirms, that *Rome* obeyed his directions in singing the Psalms, and adding the *Gloria Patri* to them; whereas whoever considers the Learning and Authority of *S. Hierom* in that Age, will not think it at all improbable, that he should teach the Roman Bishop. And *Binius* is forced to cite this Epistle wrong in his Notes, to get a seeming Argument against it; for the Epistle doth not advise them to sing the *Gloria Patri*. after the manner of the East (as he quotes it;) but to sing it, to shew their Consent to the Nicene Faith. The fourth Epistle of *Damasus*, to *Stephen* Archbishop of the Council of *Mauritania*, with *Stephen's* Epistle to him, are owned by *Labbé* to be both spurious (g). But since they magnifie the Popes Supremacy, *Binius* justifies them both; for whose confutation let it be noted, 1. That it is absurd to style a Man Archbishop of a Council: Secondly, That in this Epistle is quoted a forged Epistle of *Felix*, owned by *Binius* himself to be spurious (h): Thirdly, That place of *Matth. XVI.* is falsely quoted here, and thus read, *Thou art Peter, and upon thy foundation will I set the Pillars* (that is, the Bishops) of the Church: Fourthly, The later of them is dated with *Flavius* and *Stillico*, who were not Consuls till *Damasus* had been in his Grave full twenty year, as *Labbé* confesses; wherefore we justly discard these gross Forgeries devised of old, and defended now only to support the Popes usurped Power. The fifth Epistle says, *The Institution of the Chorepiscopi was very wicked and extreme evil*; yet presently after

(f) Lab. p. 868.  
Bin. pag. 506.  
col. 1.

(g) Lab. Marg.  
pag. 869.  
Bin. pag. 506,  
&c.

(h) Bin. p. 499.

after it owns, they were appointed in imitation of the LXX Disciples, and were at first necessary for the Primitive Church; it is also dated with *Libius* and *Theodosius*, who were never Consuls in *Damasus's* time, and finally *Labbe* owns, that much of it is stolen out of the Epistles of later Popes (i); yet *Binius* will not reject it, because it hath some kind touches for the Supremacy. The sixth Epistle to the Bishops of *Illyricum* passes Muster also with him, though it be dated with *Siricius* and *Ardaburus*, who were Consuls till 30 years after *Damasus* was dead (k). The 7th Epistle is dated with the same Consuls; yet *Binius* allows of it, because in it the Pope pretends to give Laws not only to *Italy*, but to all the World, though *Labbe* confess the Cheat, and owns it was stolen by *Isidore* out of *Leo's* 47th Epistle (l). So unfortunate is their Supremacy, that whatever seems to give any countenance to it, always proves to be Forged. The Decrees attributed to this Pope seem to have been the invention of later Ages; for it is not probable *Damasus* would have Fathered a Lye upon the *Nicene Council*, in saying, *It was decreed there, that Lay-men should not meddle with Oblations* (m); or that he would say, *Such as broke the Canons, were guilty of the Sin against the Holy Ghost*: Nor doth his Decree about the Pall agree to this Age. So that *Damasus's* Name hath for better credit been clapt to these Decrees by the modern Compilers, who are the Guides to our Editors.

About this time the *Arians* having the Emperour *Valens* on their side, began to grow bold; but *Athanasius* condemned them in *Egypt* by divers Synods, and upon his Admonition *Damasus* held two Synods at *Rome*, in the first of which, *Ursacius* and *Valens*, two *Arian* Bishops were condemned, and in the later, *Auxentius* the *Arian* Bishop of *Milan* was deposed; not by the Popes single Authority, as the Notes and *Baronius* vainly pretend (n), but by the common Suffrage of Ninety Bishops assembled with him, as the words of *Athanasius*, and the very Councils Letter plainly shew. And though *Baronius* here talks of the Popes sole Priviledge in de-

(i) *Lab. p. 876.*  
*Bin. pag. 509.*  
col. 1.

(k) *Lab. p. 882.*  
*Bin. pag. 511.*  
col. 1.

(l) *Lab. p. 883.*  
*Bin. pag. 511.*  
col. 2.

(m) *Lab. p. 885.*  
*Bin. pag. 512.*  
col. 1.

An. Dom. 369.

(n) *Bin. p. 512.*  
& 513.  
*Baron. An. 369.*  
pag. 190. &c.

posing Bishops, there are innumerable Instances of Bishops deposed without the Popes leave or knowledge; and *Auxentius* valued and believed *Damasus* his Authority so little, that notwithstanding this Sentence of the Pope in Council, he kept his Bishopric till his Death.

An.Dom. 373.

*Apollinaris* having disseminated his Heresie at *Antioch*, complaint was made to *Damasus* of one *Vitalis* who held those Errors; but the Pope (who had not the gift of discerning the Spirits) was imposed on by his subscribing a plausible Confession of Faith, so that he writ on his behalf to *Paulinus* Bishop of *Antioch* (o). 'Tis true, at the request of *S.Basil*, *Damasus* did this year joyn with *Peter*, Bishop of *Alexandria* (who was then at *Rome*)

(o) *Baron. An.*  
373 pag. 301.

(p) *Lab. p. 895.*  
*Ein. pag. 514.*  
col. 1.

in condemning *Apollinaris* in a Roman Council (p); but *Nazianzen* saith, *He did not this till he was better instructed in the Points*: For at first (as the Notes confess) this Pope took *Apollinaris* for a pious and learned Man; and so held Communion with him till he understood by *S.Basil's* third Epistle, that he was an Heretic. I know they excuse this by saying, that *S. Basil* himself, and *Nazianzen* and *S. Hieron* were all at first under the same mistake with *Damasus*: But then none of these ever were pretended to be Infallible Judges in matters of Faith, as *Baronius* holds *Damasus* was; so that the mistake in them is pardonable, but upon *Baronius* Principles I see not how *Damasus* his Infallibility can be secured, when he was so long deceived by a Heretic, and was forced to be instructed by a private Bishop at last, even in cases of Heresie.

The next year a Council was held at *Valentia* in *Dauphiné*, the true Title of which saith, it was under *Gratian* and *Valentinian* (the Emperours;) but the Editors put a new Title over it, and say it was under *Damasus* (q), who is not once named in it; the French Bishops there assembled making Canons for their own Churches, without asking the Popes leave, or desiring his Confirmation.

(q) *Lab. p. 904.*  
*Ein. pag. 516.*  
col. 1.

An.Dom. 378.

Upon the death of *Valens* the *Arian* Emperour, while *Valentinian* was yet very young, *Gratian* managed both  
the



## Part II. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

131

the Eastern and Western Empire, and he makes a Law to suppress all Heresies, and to take away the use of Churches from all such as were not in Communion with Damasus Bishop of Rome, and Peter of Alexandria (r). Theodoret (r) Sozom. lib. 7: indeed (who as Baronius owns is much mistaken in his cap. 4. relating this matter (s)) names only Damasus in his report of this Law; and Baronius cites the Law out of him, meerly to make it seem as if Damasus were made the sole Standard of Catholic Communion, though the Original Law still extant (t), and all other Historians, name Peter of Alexandria as equal with Damasus: perhaps the Reader may wonder there is no other Patriarch named in this Law; but it must be observed, that Antioch at this time had two Orthodox Bishops, who separated from each other, Meletius and Paulinus, to make up which unhappy Schism there was a Synod this year held at Antioch, under Damasus (u), say the Editors; but in truth, under the Emperours Legate, who was sent to see a Peace concluded between these two Bishops by the advice of the Council there assembled: And Damasus had so little interest in this Council, that Meletius was generally approved for the true Bishop, and Paulinus (whose party the Pope favoured) ordered only to come in after Meletius his Death (w): So that since this Council acted contrary to the mind of Damasus, it is very improper to say, it was held under him.

(r) Sozom. lib. 7:

cap. 4.

Socrat. lib. 5.

cap. 2.

s. Theod. lib. 5.

cap. 2. &c

Baron. An. 378.

pag. 339.

(t) Cod. Justin.

lib. 1. tit. 1. de

sum. Trin. Ll. 1.

(u) Lab. p. 908.

Bin. pag. 517.

col. 1.

(w) Socrat.

lib. 5. cap. 5.

Sozom. lib. 7.

cap. 3.

Theod. lib. 5. c. 3.

§. 27. The second General Council at Constantinople was Called by the Emperour Theodosius, whom Gratian had taken for his Partner in the Empire, and assigned him for his share the Eastern Provinces; where this pious Prince finding great differences in Religion, he Convened this Council to confirm the Nicene Faith, to settle Ecclesiastical Matters, and to determine the Affairs of the See of Constantinople. This Council the Editors introduce with a Preface or general History, and conclude it with partial and false Notes, hoping to perswade the World, that it was both called and

An. Dom. 381.

confirmed by the Pope : For which end we read in the Preface, *That Theodosius made a Law for all to follow the Faith, which the Apostle Peter delivered to the Romans, and which Pope Damasus preached* (x); which shews, as if the Pope were the sole preserver of the Faith; whereas the Law it self truly cited runs thus, — *which Pope Damasus, and Peter Bishop of Alexandria, a man of Apostolical Sanctity, are known to follow* (y). And in another Law of the same Emperours next year, those are declared to be Catholics, and capable of Benefices, who were in Communion *with the Bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, Laodicea, Tarsus and Iconium* (z); and in that Law neither *Damasus* nor *Rome* are mentioned; which shews, it was not the peculiar privilege of any See, for its Bishop to be made the standard of Catholic Communion, but the known Orthodox Opinion of that Bishop who sat in this or that eminent Church. The rest of the Forgeries in this Council, will best appear by considering, First, By whom this Council was called: Secondly, By whom it was confirmed: Thirdly, What Authority hath been ascribed to it: And, Fourthly, Whether the Canons and Creed ascribed to it be Authentic.

First, As to the Calling this Council, *Baronius* had twice guessed, but never proved that *Damasus* moved *Theodosius* to call it (a); this the Preface improves and faith, *It was called by the Emperour, not without Damasus his Authority*; and the Title before the Notes, advance it still, — *gathered* (say they) *by the Authority of Pope Damasus, and the favour of Theodosius* (b). But when this is to be proved, their Evidence is, pretended Monuments in the *Vatican*, that *Shop of Forgeries*; the testimony of later Popes in their own cause, and some very remote Conjectures and fraudulent Inferences: Yet at last they affirm, *That none but a pertinacious Heretic will affirm, that this Pious Emperour, who was most observant of the Sacred Canons would call this Synod* (c). By which bold Censure, they condemn not only all the ancient Historians, but all the Fathers here assembled for

(x) *Lab. p. 915.*  
*Bin. pag. 521.*

(y) *Cod. Justin.*  
*ut supr. &c.*  
*Baron. An. 380.*  
*pag. 358.*

(z) *Baron. An.*  
*381. pag. 384.*

(a) *Baron An.*  
*380. pag. 359.*  
*& pag. 362.*

(b) *Bin. p. 540.*

(c) *Lab. p. 968.*  
*Bin. pag. 542.*  
*col. 1.*

for pertinacious Heretics: For the Councils Letter to *Theodosius* saith, *We were called together by your Epistle* (d); (d) *Lab. p. 946.* and when they were to have met at *Rome*, they affirm, *That Damasus summoned them to meet there, by the Emperours Letters* (e). *Socrates* also and *Sozomen* expressly say, *The Emperour called this Synod at Constantinople* (f). *Theodoret* also doth affirm the same (g), though the Notes strive to pervert his words: But *Richerius*, a Learned Romanist (h) hath fully cleared this Point, and shewed that *Theodosius* called this General Council by his sole Authority. And the Acts of the sixth General Council, with *Photius* (cited falsly in these Notes) do only import, that the Pope gave a subsequent consent to it, which is no proof that he was concerned in calling it.

Secondly, As to the confirming it, the Preface and the Notes confidently aver, *That they sent their Acts to Damasus to be approved, and he did confirm them* (i); yet they tell us, that Pope *Gregory* above 200 year after declared, *That the Church of Rome as yet neither had, nor received the Acts of this Council.* I know they would shuffle off this Contradiction, by pretending that *Damasus* confirmed only the Matters of Faith, not the Canons: But first, *Gregory* denies their having the Acts of this Council, and the Acts contain Matters of Faith as well as Canons; Secondly, they can not shew any proof, that *Damasus* made any distinction: If he confirmed any thing, it was all; for if subsequent consent be confirmation, then he consented to all, and confirmed all that was done here. But in our Sense of giving an Authentic Character to this Councils Decrees, *Theodosius* alone confirmed them; for the Bishops desire him, by his Pious Edict to confirm the Decrees of this Synod (k): (k) *Lab. p. 946.* And they writ not to *Damasus* till the year after the Synod, and their Letter was directed not to him alone, but to *Ambrose* and other Western Bishops with him (l); nor do they in it desire any confirmation from him or any of them, but say, *That they and all others ought to approve of their Faith, and rejoice with them for* all

all the good things which they had done; with which Letter probably they sent (as was usual) a Transcript of all their Acts: And Photius saith, *That Damasus, Bishop of Rome afterwards agreed with these Bishops, and confirmed what they had done* (m); that is, by consenting to it, which is no more than every absent Bishop may do, who in a large Sense may be said to confirm a Council, when he agrees to the Acts of it after they are brought to him.

Thirdly, The Authority of this Council is undoubted, having been ever called and accounted the Second General Council, and so it is reckoned in all places where the General Councils are mentioned, which Title it had not, as Bellarmin vainly suggests, *Because at the time when this was assembled in the East, the Western Bishops met at Rome*: For that obscure Synod is not taken notice of, while this is every where celebrated, as held at *Constantinople*, and consisting of one hundred and fifty Bishops, which were they who met in the East (n). As for *Damasus*, Baronius cannot prove he was concerned in it, but by *we think, and we may believe* (o); yet he elsewhere boldly says, *Damasus gave it Supreme Authority* (p); and the Annotator makes it impossible for any Council to be general, unless the Pope or his Legates be there. Now he and all others call this *A General Council*: And yet he saith, *That neither Pope Damasus, nor his Legates were Presidents of it, nor was he or any Western Bishop in it*. Whence we learn, That there may be a General Council, at which the Pope is not present, by himself, nor by his Legates, and of which neither he nor they are Presidents.

Fourthly, As to the Creed and Canons here made, the modern Romanists without any proof suppose, that *Damasus* allowed the former, and not the later: But if he allowed the famous Creed here made, I ask, Whether it then had these words [*And from the Son*] or no? If it had, why do the Notes say, *That these words were added to it by the Bishops of Spain and the Authority of Pope Leo long after* (q)? But if these words were

(m) Photius de  
7 Synod. cap. 2.

(n) Lab. p. 967.  
Bin. pag. 541.  
col. 2.

(o) Baron. An.  
380 p. 359. &  
An. 381 p. 368.

(p) Idem p. 382.

(q) Lab. p. 972.  
Bin. pag. 543.  
col. 2.

were wanting, as they seem to confess, (when they say, *The Roman Church long used this Creed without this addition*) then I must desire to know, how a Man of their Church can be secure of his Faith, if what was (as they say) confirmed by *Damasus* in a General Council, may be altered by a few Bishops and another Pope, without any General Council? As to the Canons, *Damasus* made no objection against them in his time, and it is very certain that the Bishop of *Constantinople* after this Council, always had the second place. For as the first General Council at *Nice* gave old *Rome* the first place, as being the Imperial City; so this second General Council doubted not, but when *Constantinople* was become new *Rome*, and an Imperial City also; they had power to give it the second place, and suitable Privileges. Yea, the Notes confess, that *S. Chrysostom*, by virtue of this Canon, placed and displaced divers Bishops in *Asia*, and the 4th General Council at *Chalcedon* (without regarding the dissent of the Popes Legates) allowed the Bishop of *Constantinople* the second place, and made his Privileges equal to those of Old *Rome* (r); which Precedence and Power that Bishop long retained, notwithstanding the endeavours of the envious Popes: And *Gregory* never objected against these Canons, till he began to fear the growing Greatness of the Patriarch of *Constantinople*; but when that Church and Empire was sinking, and there appeared no danger on that side to the Popes, then *Innocent* the Third is said by the Notes, to revive and allow this Canon again; by which we see, that nothing but Interest governs that Church, and guides her Bishops in allowing or discharging any Council: For now again, when the Reformed begin to urge this Canon, *Baronius* and the Notes say, *They can prove by firm Reasons, that this Canon was forged by the Greeks*: But their Reasons are very frivolous, *They say Anatolius did not quote this Canon against Pope Leo*: I reply, 'Tis very probable he did, because *Leo* saith, *He pleaded the Consent of many Bishops*; that is, (if *Leo* would have spoken out) *In this General Council.*

(r) Vid. Concil.  
Chalced. Can.  
23. & Subscrip.  
ibid.

(s) *Socrat.* lib. 5.  
cap. 2.  
*Sozom.* lib. 7.  
cap. 8.

*Council.* Secondly, They urge that this Canon is not mentioned in the Letter writ to *Damasus*. I Answer, They have told us before, they sent their Acts to him, and so need not repent them in this Letter. Thirdly, They talk of the Injury done to *Timotheus* Bishop of *Alexandria*; but his Subscription is put to the Canons as well as the Creed, and it doth not appear that ever he or any of his Successors contended for Precedence after this, with the Patriarch of *Constantinople*: And that the Modern Greeks did not forge this Canon is plain, because *Socrates* and *Sozomen* both mention it (s); and the Catholic Church always owned it for Authentic. Yea, in the Council of *Chalcedon* it is declared, That the Bishop of *Constantinople* ought to have had the second place in the Factious Synod at *Ephesus*, and he is reckoned in that fourth General Council next after the Pope, whose Legates were there, and yet durst not deny him the second place, in which he sat and subscribed in that order, having first had this Canon confirmed at *Chalcedon*: So that all Churches, but that of *Rome*, submit to this General Council; and they who pretend most to venerate them, do despise and reject the Authority of General Councils, if they oppose the ends of their Pride and Avarice. To conclude, Here is a General Council called and confirmed only by the Emperour, assembled without the Pope or his Legates, decreeing Matters of Faith and of Discipline, yet every where owned and received as genuine, except at *Rome*, when Interest made them partial, and still no less valued for that by all other Churches: Which gives a severe Blow to the modern Pretences of their Papal Supremacy and Infallibility.

The same Year there was a Council at *Aquileia* in *Italy*, wherein divers *Arians* were fully heard and fairly condemned. Now this Council was called by the Emperour, the Presidents of it being *Valerian* Bishop of *Aquileia*, and *Ambrose* Bishop of *Milan*; but *Damasus* is not named in it, nor was he present at it in Person, or by his Legates, though this Council was called in *Italy* it



it self, and designed to settle a Point of Faith: But these Bishops (as the Acts shew) did not judge Heretics by the Popes Authority, but by Scripture and by solid Arguments: And they tell us, *It was then a Custom for the Eastern Bishops to hold their Councils in the East, and the Western theirs in the West* (t); which argues, they (t) *Lab. p. 983. Bin. pag. 545 col. 2.* knew of no Universal Monarchy, vested in the Pope, and giving him power over all the Bishops, both of the East and West. For it was not *Damasus*, but the Prefect of *Italy*, who writ about this Synod to the Bishops of the East (u): Nor did this Council write to the Pope, but to the Emperour, *to confirm their Sentence against Heretics*; wherefore *Damasus* had a limited Authority in those days, not reaching so much as over all *Italy*, and extended only to the Suburbicarian Regions, out of which, as being *Damasus's* peculiar Province, *Ursicinus* his Antagonist for the Papacy, was banished by the Emperour *Valentinian* (w); and therefore *Sulpicius Severus* calls him not *Orbis*, but *Urbis Episcopus* (x), the Bishop of the City, not of the World; and speaking of *Italy*, he saith in the next Page, *That the Supreme Authority at that time was in Damasus, and S. Ambrose* (y). To these two therefore the *Priscillian* Heretics applied themselves, when they were condemned by the Council of *Cæsar-Augusta*, or *Saragosa* in *Spain*, in which Country the Sect first began; but when they could not get these great Bishops to favour their Cause, they corrupted the Emperours Ministers, to procure a Rescript for their restitution (z). Now it is strange that this Council of *Saragosa* should bear the Title of [under *Damasus*,] and that the Notes should affirm, *Sulpicius Severus* plainly writes thus: For if we read *Sulpicius* as above-cited, we shall find that *Damasus* knew nothing of this Synod till long after it was risen; so we may conclude this Invention of theirs is only to support their pretended Supremacy.

(u) *Baron. An. 381. pag. 386.*

(w) *Baron. An. 371. pag. 235.*  
(x) *Sulpic. Sever. pag. 423.*

(y) *Id. pag. 424.*

(z) *Lab. p. 1011. Bin. pag. 554. col. 1.*

An Dom. 382.

(a) Lab. p. 1014.

Bin. pag. 554.

col. 2.

(b) Hieron.

Ep. 27.

(c) Theodor. lib. 5.

cap. 9.

Baron. An. 382.

pag. 397. &amp;c.

Bin. pag. 539.

col. 2.

(d) Lab. p. 1014.

Bin. pag. 554.

col. 2.

§. 28. From a Passage in S. Hieron, and the Inscription of the Letter writ from the Council at Constantinople, the Editors gather, That Paulinus Bishop of Antioch, Epiphanius Bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, and Ambrose, with other of the Western Bishops, met at Rome in Council this year, which they call the Fourth Roman Council under Damasus (a); who probably did preside in this Synod, as all Bishops use to do in their own Cities; but he did not call this Council, for S. Hieron expressly saith, The Emperours Letters called these Bishops to Rome (b). And the Synodical Letter of the Constantinopolitan Fathers tell us, That Damasus desired Theodosius to write to them also of the East to come to Rome: Which shews that Damasus could not summon them by his own Authority; but the Editors and Baronius, out of a false Latin Version of Theodoret, have put in the word [Mandato,] which word is not in the Greek, nor any thing answering to it (c); and it was foisted in on purpose, to persuade such as did not read the Original, that the Pope had commanded the Eastern Bishops to come to Rome. Again, though the Notes confess, the Acts of this Roman Council are lost, so that it doth not appear what was done there. Yet soon after they produce a long Canon for the Popes Supremacy, and the Precedence of the Patriarchs; feigning it was made in this Synod. But if the Canon be not a Vatican Forgery (which is very much to be suspected) however it is Antedated one hundred and twelve years, as Labbé confesses in his Margen; for he saith, it was decreed under Pope Gelasius, An. 494 (d). But the Policy of laying this Canon here, is to make a shew as if Damasus had then publicly declared against the Council of Constantinople giving that Bishop the second place; but their forging this Proof only shews, they have no genuine Authority for it; yet if they could prove that the Pope disliked this Precedence, since it is certain that Constantinople did take the second place according to this Canon, that would only shew that the Popes Authority was not regarded

regarded. Which also appears in the Case of *Flavianus*, who (as the Notes conjecture) was in this Roman Synod deposed, and *Paulinus* made Bishop of *Antioch*: Yet still the greatest part of the World owned *Flavianus* for the true Bishop of that See, and the Synod of *Sides*, where *Amphilocius* Bishop of *Iconium* was President, directed their Synodical Epistle to *Flavianus*, as Patriarch of *Antioch* (e); so that the Editors should not have stiled that Council, *Under Damasus*; because they acted against his Mind: And so did the Eastern Bishops, who met again this year at *Constantinsple*, when the Pope had desired them to come to *Rome*, and from this Meeting they writ that Synodical Epistle which the Editors here print over again, and wherein they call *Jerusalem*, *The Mother of all Churches*; a Title now by Usurpation appropriated only to *Rome*.

(e) *Lab. p. 1015.*  
*Bin. pag. 556.*  
*col. 2.*  
*Baron. An. 383.*

S. 29. *Siricius* succeeded *Damasus*, but not without trouble; for *Ursicinus*, the Competitor of *Damasus*, being yet alive and at *Rome*, was declared Pope by a great party, and *Prosper's* Chronicle makes him the next Pope after *Damasus* (f); nor could *Siricius* get the Chair, but by a Rescript from the Emperour *Valentinian*, which condemned *Ursicinus*, and established *Siricius* (g). There is little or no notice of him before his Election, and though he sat fifteen years (as the *Pontifical* and *Platina*,) or thirteen (as the Notes say) there is very little worthy remarking done by him: And it is very probable he was one of those ignorant Clergy-men with which the Roman Church was so well stored at that time, that *S. Hierom* saith, *Not one of them did so much as pretend to Scholarship; but this illiterate Faction, who had proclaimed War against all Learning, conspired also against him* (h). For we have reason to judge this Pope to be of their Party, because *S. Hierom* left *Rome* in disgust, as soon as *Siricius* came to be Pope; and *Paulinus* who came in his time to *Rome* saith, *The City Pope proudly despised him* (i); yea, *Baronius* owns, *That* *Ruffinus*, when he was fallen into *Origen's* Hereſie, im-

(f) *Baron. An.*  
*384. pag. 327.*  
(g) *Baron. An.*  
*385. pag. 335.*

(h) *Hieron. in*  
*Præf. ad Didym.*  
and *de Spir. Sancto.*

(i) *Paulin. ad*  
*Sever. Epist. 1.*

(k) *Baron. An.*  
397. pag. 32.  
*ex Hieron. ep. 16.*

(l) *Lab. p. 1016.*  
*Bin. pag. 557.*  
col. 1.

m) *Lab. p. 1022.*  
*Bin. pag. 559.*  
col. 2.

posed on the Simplicity of this Pope, and got Communicatory Letters of him (k); which also seems to spoil his Infalibility, for which Ignorance is no proper qualification. Yet wanting real Matter in this Pope's Life, the Notes run out into the story of the death of *Monica*, *S. Augustine's* Mother, saying, *That when she died, she was only solicitous to have the Mass offered up for her* (l), and this they prove out of *Augustine's Confessions*; but the Fathers words are, *She only desired to be commemorated in the Offices, when the Priest stood at the Altar.* Now there is a mighty difference between that ancient Custom of commemorating the Faithful departed, which is allowed by the Church of *England*, and the Popish way of offering Mass for the Souls of the Deceased, a corruption of much later date than *S. Augustine's* time.

For this Pope are published divers Decretal Epistles, which are the first that can pretend to be genuine; and if they be really so, it is plain, that their Style is mean, the Arguments trifling, and the Scripture Proofs impertinent; so that the Author was no Conjuror. The first directed to *Himerius* is very severe against Marriage, especially in the Clergy: The Notes would persuade us, *It is not lawful Marriage, which he calls Pollution* (as they say *Calvin* falsely affirms (m)); but if we read the Epistle, he calls *New Marriages* (that is, the Marriage of such as had been Widows) *Pollution*, as well as those Marriages which were prohibited. Again, he foolishly attempts to prove, Clergy-men ought not to Marry, because *S. Paul* saith, *Those that are in the flesh cannot please God*; and though he confess it was usual for many Clergy-men to live with their Wives, he calls that cohabitation, *the being polluted with carnal Concupiscence*, in his 4th Epistle: So that he is justly taxed with speaking profanely of God's holy Ordinance, and of contradicting *S. Paul*, who excepted not the Clergy, when he said, *Marriage is honourable in all men, and the Bed undefiled*, *Hebr. XIII. 4.* And probably it was the hot and bold discourses of *Siricius* and some other Writers of this time, which provoked

Jovi.

*Jovinian*, not only to stand up for Marriage, but to decry Single Life, the merit of which had so possessed the minds of some great Men, that they resolved to condemn *Jovinian* for an Heretic. As for the second Epistle of *Siricius* to the Council at *Milan*, relating to this Resolve, it may be questioned whether it be genuine; but that the style is harsh and barbarous is unquestionable. The Answer to this Letter from *Milan* is evidently patched up out of divers Authors who writ upon this Subject. However *S. Ambrose* and his Suffragans there, call the Pope Brother, even when they Complement him, as a great Master and Doctor (n), which smells strong of the Forge; and if this Epistle were made up there, then the Notes need not triumph so much, when it says, (upon *Jovinians* being condemned at *Rome*) That the Bishop of *Rome* had looked well to the Gate committed to him; that is (say they) the Gate of the whole Church of which Christ made *S. Peter's* Successor the Door-keepers (o). But if the Epistle be true, it only commends the Pope for looking well to the Gate of his own Church at *Rome*, as they had done to their Gate at *Milan*, having turned him out of that Church before. The third Epistle of *Siricius* is like the former for style and sense, yet the Editors will not reject it, because the Pope saith, He hath the care of all the Churches (p); but let it be noted, that *Aurelius* Bishop of *Carthage* uses the same words of himself a little after (q), and there *Binus* notes, That *Aurelius* means, of the Churches of *Africa* only, not of the whole World: So we may say justly of *Siricius* here, that he means, He had the Care of the Suburbicarian Churches, not those of the whole World. For the fourth Epistle (said to be writ from a Roman Council) calls the Pope no more but a *Primate* (r), and that Title belonged to the Bishop of *Carthage*, as well as to him of *Rome*; but indeed *Labbe* honestly confesses this fourth Epistle to be stolen out of *Innocent's* Epistle to *Vitricius*. The fifth and sixth Epistles are writ by *Maximus*, an Usurper of the Empire, and seem to be genuine; but we need not wonder at the Tyrants speaking so kind things of the

(n) *Lab. p. 1024.*  
*Bin. pag. 560.*  
&c 561.

(o) *Lab. p. 1027.*  
*Bin. pag. 561.*  
col. 1.  
*Baron. An. 390.*  
pag. 536.

(p) *Lab. p. 1027.*  
*Bin. p. 561.*  
col. 2.  
(q) *Bin. p. 577.*  
col. 1.

(r) *Lab. p. 1029.*  
*Bin. pag. 562.*  
col. 1.

the Pope in them, since it was his interest to Flatter the Bishop of that potent City.

(s) Lab. p. 1030.  
Bin. pag. 563.  
col. 2.

§. 30. This *Maximus* having seized on the North-west parts of the Empire, summoned a Council at *Bourdeaux* (which the Editors without any ground style, under *Siricius*) wherein the Bishops of the *Galican* Church again condemned the *Priscillianists*, and they appealed (not to the Pope, but) to the Emperour *Maximus* (s) who was so far from favouring these Heretics, that at the instance of *Ithacius*, a Catholic Bishop, he caused them to be put to death for their Heresie: Which cruel Sentence so displeased *Theognistus* and other Orthodox Bishops, that they Excommunicated *Ithacius* and all his Party, who had procured these Heretics to be put to death; and *S. Martin*, *S. Ambrose*, and the best Men of that Age, would not communicate with any of these Bishops, who had prosecuted Men to death for Heresie; no not though *Ithacius* and his Adherents were absolved from *Theognistus* his Excommunication in a Council which *Maximus* had called at *Triers*. Now the Notes, fearing the Reader should observe, That many Popes and Bishops of their Communion have done just as *Ithacius* did, viz. persecuted, such as they call Heretics, to death, and delivered them up to the Secular Magistrate to be executed, tell us, That it was not an ill thing in *Ithacius* to procure the death of these Heretics, but his Fault was in the violence of his Proceedings, and in his not interposing such a Protestation as their Church uses on these occasions. Wherein, when they have made it necessary for the Magistrate to put an Heretic to death, they solemnly declare, they wish he would amend, and do not desire his Execution (t). But as this Protestation is a piece of notorious Hypocrisie unknown to those Ages; so we may be sure so apparent a Sham would not have excused *Ithacius*, whose Communion (as *Salpicius Severus* shews) was renounced by *S. Ambrose*, *S. Martin* and Others, purely because they thought it unlawful, especially for Clergy-men, to procure any persons

(t) Lab. p. 1038.  
Bin. pag. 564.  
col. 1.  
Baron. An. 386.  
pag. 451.



persons to be put to death for their Opinion, though it were Heresie. Wherefore these Holy Bishops, if they were now alive, must renounce the Communion of the Roman Church for the same reason, for which they renounced the Communion of *Ishacius*, even for their frequent procuring Heretics to be put to death; and this is so plain, that all their shuffling Notes cannot wash their Bishops hands from Blood, nor fit them in *S. Ambrose* and *S. Martin's* Opinion, to celebrate the Eucharist with other Christians.

There had been (as we noted) a long Schism at *Antioch*, between *Paulinus* (of whose side was the Pope, and many Western Bishops) and *Flavianus*, who was supported by the Eastern Bishops; and now *Paulinus* dying, one *Evagrius* was irregularly chosen to succeed him, and keep up the Schism; and though *Flavianus* was owned for the true Bishop by the second General Council, and he it was who ordained *S. Chrysostom*, and obtained a Pardon from *Theodosius* for those Citizens of *Antioch*, who had broke down the Statues of that Emperour and his Empress; yet at the Instance of some Western Bishops the Emperour was perswaded to cite him to a Council, which he had called at *Capua*, in which *S. Ambrose* was present; but *Flavianus* not willing to have his Enemies to be his Judges, did easily excuse his Non-appearance to the Emperour, and the Synod thereupon referred the Matter between him and *Evagrius* unto *Theophilus*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, to whose decision *Flavianus* refusing to stand, he appealed to *Theodosius*; on which occasion *S. Ambrose* writing to *Theophilus*, wishes rather *Flavianus* had referred the Matter to his Brother the Bishop of Rome, because (saith he) you would probably have judged it (if it had come before you) so as he would have liked (u). Which implies (u) *Ambrose* no more, than that *Theophilus* and *Siricius* were both of one mind in this case of *Flavianus*; yet on this slight occasion the Notes say, That the Synod made *Theophilus* Arbitrator on condition, he should offer his Sentence to be approved and confirmed by the Roman Church

An. Dom. 392.

(u) *Ambrose* d. *Theophilus* ep. 78.

(w) Lab. p. 1039  
Bin. pag. 564.  
col. 1.

*Church* (w): Which is a meer Forgery; for *Theophilus* was made absolute Arbitrator by the Synod, and this is not the Councils wish, but *S. Ambroses*; and after all *Flavianus* did not think a Western Synod had any power over him; and therefore he rejected the Arbitration of *Theophilus*, the Council, and Pope *Siricius* also, with whom though he did not communicate, yet he was always owned to be true Bishop of *Antioch*.

(x) Lab. p. 1041.  
Bin. pag. 566.  
col. 2.

§. 31. The Second Council at *Arles* is supposed to be held about this time, because the Followers of *Photinus* and *Bonofus* were there condemned: Wherefore they say, *It was in the time of Siricius*; but under him it could not be, since the Bishops there assembled do not name him, nor do they except the Bishop of *Rome's* Supreme Power, when they refer all Ecclesiastical Matters to the final decision of their own Metropolitan and his Synod, and declare, that every Bishop who receives a person Excommunicated by another, shall be guilty of Schism. Yet the Editors are so apt to dote upon the Popes managing all Councils, that they here style a meeting of the *Novatian* Heretics at *Angarus* in *Bithynia* (x), *A Synod under Siricius*; and call poor *Socrates* a *Novatian*, for barely relating a Matter of Fact concerning the *Novatians*.

An. Dom. 393.

At this time there was a great Council at *Hippo*, which the Notes sometimes call a *General*, and sometimes a *Plenary Council*, because most of the *African* Bishops were there, and the Original dates it with the Consuls of this year; but the Editors clap a New Title to it, saying, it was *under Siricius*; who in all probability had no hand in it, nor knew any thing of it: Yet here were made many of those famous Canons for Discipline, by which the *African Church* was governed. But they are more wary in the next Council of *Constantinople*, at which many Bishops were present, and among them the two Patriarchs of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*; being summoned (in the absence of the Emperor) by his Prefect *Ruffinus*; and they will not venture

venture to say, *This was under Siricius*, for the Matters treated on it wholly related to the Eastern Church, and in that Age they rarely allowed the Pope to concern himself in their Affairs: No nor in *Afric* neither, where (*Anno 395*) there were Councils held both by the Orthodox and the Donatists, which are dated by the Consuls, and no notice is taken of the Pope (y). (y) *Lab. p. 1153.*  
 We shall only observe, that upon one of these Councils *Bin. pag. 567.*  
 the Notes say, *It is a mark of the Donatists, being of the col. 2.*  
*Synagogue of Antichrist, that they named the several Parties among them from the Leaders and Founders of their several Sects, and were not content with the Name of Christians from Christ.* Which Note reflects upon the Monks of their own Church, who are called *Benedictines, Dominicans, and Franciscans*, from the Founders of their several Orders.

In the Council of *Turin*, composed of the *Gallican* *An. Dom. 397.*  
 Bishops, they decided the Case of Primacy between the Bishop of *Arles* and *Vienna*, without advising with the Pope, and determined *they would not communicate with Felix, a Bishop of Ithacius his Party, according to the Letters of Ambrose, of Blessed Memory, Bishop of Milan, and of the Bishop of Rome.* Now, here the Roman Advocates are much disturbed to find *S. Ambrose* his Name before *Siricius*; and when they repeat this Passage in the Notes, they falsely set the Pope's Name first, contrary to the express words of the sixth Canon, and impudently pretend, *That the Bishop of Rome, by his place, was the ordinary Judge who should be communicated with, and Ambrose was only made so by the Popes Delegation* (z). But, how absurd is it (if this were so) (z) *Lab. p. 1157, & 1158.*  
 for the Council to place the Name of the Delegate, before his who gave him power? And every one may see, that this Council was directed to mark this *Bin. pag. 568. & 569.*  
 Decree principally by *S. Ambrose* his Advice, and secondarily by the Popes; for at that time *Ambrose* his Fame and Interest was greater than that of *Siricius*; yet after all, the Council decreed this, not by the Authority of either of these Bishops (as the Notes pretend,)

pretend,) but only by their Information, and upon their Advice by these Letters, which were not first read (as they pretend) but after four other businesses were dispatched.

An.Dom. 397.  
&c.

The Canons of divers African Councils, held at Carthage and elsewhere, have been put together long since, and collected into one Code, which makes the time and order of the Councils wherein they were made, somewhat difficult; but since the Canons were always held Authentic, we need not (with the Editors) be much concerned for their exact order, or for reducing them to the years of the Pope, because they were neither called nor ratified by his Authority. Yea, the Notes say, *It was never heard that any, but the Bishop of Carthage called a Council there, his Letters gave Summons to it, he presided over it, and first gave his Suffrage in it, ——— and that even when Faustinus (an Italian Bishop) the Popes Legate was pre-*

(a) Lab. p. 1163.  
Bin. pag. 573.  
col. 1. & 2.

sent (a). As for the particular Canons of the third Council, the Nineteenth saith, *That the Readers shall either profess Continence; or they shall be compelled to Marry; but they feign old Copies which say, They shall not be allowed to Read, if they will not contain* (b); the falshood of which appears by the 25th Canon in the Greek and Latin Edition, where this is said of the Clergy, *ἐξαιρέτως ἀναγνώσκων*; that is, *Except the Readers*, which

(b) Lab. p. 1170.  
Bin. pag. 575.  
col. 1.

they translate, *Quamvis Lectorum* (c), on purpose to make us think, that the command of Celibacy (upon which that Age too much doted) reached the lowest order of the Clergy, even Readers; contrary to the express words of the Canons. And to the second Council of Carthage, where only Bishops, Priests and

(c) Bin. p. 580.

Deacons are under an obligation to live single (d). Secondly, The 26th Canon of the third Council forbids the Bishop of the first See, to be called by the Title

(d) Lab. p. 1170.  
Bin. pag. 575.  
col. 2. &c.

of Prince, or Chief of Bishops, (Gratian goes on) *neither may the Roman Bishop be called Universal* (e). The

Gratian. Decret.  
part 1. dist. 99.

Notes tax Gratian indeed for adding this Sentence; but if he did, it was out of Pope Gregory, who saith, *Tha*

no

no Patriarch ought to be called Universal. Besides, considering how apt the Editors are to strike out words not Agreeable to the Interest of Rome, it is more probable that some of the Popes Friends lately left these words out, than that Gratian put them in: And since this Council forbid Appeals to foreign Judicatures with peculiar respect to Rome, to which some of the Criminal Clergy then began to appeal (f), it is not unlikely these Fathers might resolve to check as well the Title, as the Jurisdiction (then beginning to be set up) which encouraged these Appeals. Thirdly, The 47th Canon in the Latin, and the 24th in the Greek and Latin Edition, speaking of such Books, as are so far Canonical that they may be read in Churches, reckon up some of those Books which we call Apocryphal, upon which the Notes triumph (g); but let it be observed, that we grant some of these Books to be so far Canonical, that they may be read for instruction of Manners; and also we may note, that the best Editions of these African Canons leave out all the Books of *Maccabees* and *Baruch* (which are foisted into their later Latin Copies (h)). And it is plain, the whole Canon is falsely placed in this Council under *Siricius*, because Pope *Boniface* (who came not into the Papacy till above twenty years after) is named in it as Bishop of Rome; yet after all these devices, it doth not declare what Books are strictly Canonical, and so will not justify the Decree at *Trent*. Fourthly, In the 48th Canon of the Latin Version, the Council agrees to advise about the Donatists, with *Siricius* Bishop of Rome, and *Simplicianus* Bishop of Milan, not giving any more deference to one of these Bishops than to the other, but looking on them as equally fit to advise them: Yet the Notes boldly say, *They advise with the Pope, because they knew he presided, as a Bishop and Doctor, over the Catholic Church; but with the Bishop of Milan only, as a Man every where famous for his Learning* (i). Which is a meer Fiction of their own, for the words of the Canon shew, that these Fathers did not believe either of them

(f) Lab. p. 1171.  
Bin. pag. 581.  
col. 2.

(g) Lab. p. 1177.  
Bin. pag. 580.  
col. 1.

(h) Cosen's  
History of the  
Canon p. 112.  
& pag. 113.

(i) Lab. p. 1183.  
Bin. pag. 584.  
col. 2.

had any Authority over them, only they desired their advice joyntly, as being both Eminent and Neighbouring Bishops, and their prohibiting Appeals shews, they knew nothing of the Popes presiding over the Catholic Church.

Aa.Dom.398.

(k) *Baron. An.*  
401. p.128,  
&c 129.

§. 32. *Anastasius* was the last Pope in this Century, of whom there would have been as little notice taken, as of Many of his Predecessors, if it had not been his good fortune to be known, both to *S. Hierom* and *S. Augustine*, and to assist the latter in suppressing the Donatists, and the former in condemning the Errours of *Origen*, for which cause these two Fathers make an honourable mention of him. Yet in the *African* Councils, where he is named with respect, they joyn *Venerius* Bishop of *Milan* with him, and call them *Their Brethren* and *Fellow-Bishops* (k). As for the qualifications of *Anastasius*, *S. Hierom* gives him great Encomiums; but it must be observed, that at this time *Hierom* had charged *Ruffinus* with broaching the Heresies of *Origen* at *Rome*, and he being then at *Bethlem*, could not beat down these Opinions without the Popes help. And indeed, when *Ruffinus* came first to *Rome* he was received kindly by the last Pope *Siricius*, and *Anastasius* did not perceive any Errours in *Ruffinus* or *Origen*, till *S. Hierom* (upon *Pammachius* Information) had opened his Eyes; and at last, it was three years before this Pope could be made so sensible of this Heresie, as to condemn it: So that notwithstanding his Infallibility, if *S. Hierom* and his Friends had not discovered these Errours, they might in a little time have been declared for Orthodox Truths at *Rome*; but *Anastasius* condemning them at last, did wonderfully oblige *S. Hierom*, and this was the occasion of many of his Commendations. For this Pope are published three Decretal Epistles, though *Baronius* mentions but two, and condemns the first for a Forgery, and so doth *Labbe* (l); It is directed to the Bishops of *Germany* and *Burgundy*, and yet *Burgundy*

(l) *Lab. p. 1191.*  
*Bin. pag. 585.*  
col. 2.  
*Baron. An. 402.*  
pag. 161.



## Part II. Roman Forgeries in the Councils.

149

*gundy* did not receive the Christian Faith till the Year 413; it is also dated with the Consuls of the Year 385, that is, Fourteen years before *Anastasius* was Pope. The matter of it is grounded on the *Pontifical*, which speaks of a Decree made by this Pope for the Priests at *Rome* to stand up at the Gospel; which the Forger of this Epistle turns into a general Law, and makes it be prescribed to the *Germans*. The Words of it are stolen out of the Epistles of Pope *Gregory* and *Leo* (m); yet out of this Forgery they cite that Passage for the Supremacy, where the *German Bishops* are advised to send to him as the Head. The second Epistle (n) is also spurious, being dated fifteen or sixteen years after *Anastasius* his death, and stolen out of *Leo's* 59th Epistle. As for the third Epistle, it is certain he did write to *John*, Bishop of *Jerusalem*, but it may be doubted whether this be the Epistle or no (o); if it be genuine, it argues the Pope was no good Oratour, because it is writ in mean Latin; yet that was the only Language he understood, for he declares in this Epistle, *That he knew not who Origen was, nor what Opinions he held, till his Works were translated into Latin*. So that any Heretic who had writ in Greek in this Pope's time, had been safe enough from the Censure of this Infatigable Judge.

The Notes dispute about the fourth Council of *Carthage*, whether it were under Pope *Zosimus* or *Anastasius* (p); but it was under neither, the true Title of it shewing it was dated by the Consuls Names, and Called by *Aurelius* Bishop of *Carthage*, who made many excellent Canons here without any assistance from the Pope. The 51st, 52d and 53d Canons of this Council order Monks to get their Living, not by Begging, but by honest Labour; and the Notes shew, This was the Primitive use (q); which condemns those vast numbers of Idle Monks and Mendicant Fryers, now allowed in the Church of *Rome*. The hundredth Canon absolutely forbids a Woman to presume to Baptize; but

(m) *Gregor.*  
lib. 12 Ep. 12.  
*Leon. Ep. 2.*  
ad *Episc. Ital.*  
(n) *Lab. p. 1193.*  
*Bin. pag. 586.*  
col. 2.

(o) *Lab. p. 1194.*  
*Bin. pag. 586.*  
col. 2.

(p) *Lab. p. 1208.*  
*Bin. pag. 592.*  
col. 1.

(q) *Lab. p. 1210.*  
*Bin. pag. 592.*  
col. 1.

(r) Lab. p. 1211.

Bin. ut supr.

*This addition is to be found  
in Gratian's { de consec.  
d. d. 6. 20. Mulier } and is  
remarked by Bealle in  
the Preface. B. d. d. d.  
p. 10. verb. Lat. Genes. 1553.*

but the Notes (r), (because this practice is permitted in their Church) add to this Canon these words, *unless in case of necessity, and except when no Priest is present.* Which shews how little reverence they have for ancient Canons, since they add to them, or diminish them, as they please to make them agree with their modern Corruptions.

In the fifth Council of Carthage, Can. 3. Bishops and Priests are forbid to accompany with their Wives *contra rē idius q̄us*, that is, *at the time of their being to Officiate*; but in their Latin Copies it is altered thus, *—according to their own, (or, to their former) Statutes*; which makes it a general and total Prohibition: But the Greek words of this Canon are cited, and expounded at the great Council in Trullo, where many African Bishops were present, as importing only a Prohibition of accompanying their Wives, when their turns came to Minister (s); which is the true sense of this Canon, though the Romanists, for their Churches Credit would impose another. The fourteenth Canon of this Council takes notice of the feigned Relicks of Martyrs, and of Altars built in Fields and Highways, upon pretended Dreams and Revelations; upon which Canon there is no note at all (r), because they know, if all the feigned Relicks were to be thrown away, and all the Altars built upon Dreams and false Revelations pulled down in the present Roman Church, (as was ordered at Carthage by this Canon) there would be very few left to carry on their gainful Trade, which hath thrived wonderfully by these Impositions.

(s) Lab. p. 1219.

Bin. pag. 594.

col. 2.

Beveridg. Con-

cil. Tom. II.

pag. 130.

(t) Lab. p. 1217.

Bin. pag. 594.

col. 1.

(u) Bin. p. 595.

This Century concludes with a Council at Alexandria, which they style *under Anastasius* (u); but it was called by Theophilus, who found out and condemned the Errours of Origen long before poor Anastasius knew any thing of the matter. The Notes indeed say, *This Synod sent their Decrees to Pope Anastasius, to Epiphanius, Chrysostom and Hierom*: But though they place the Pope foremost, there is no proof that they were sent

to

to him at all. *Baronius* only conjectures they did, and faith, *It is fit we should believe this (w)*; but it is certain (w) *Baron. An. Theophilus* sent these Decrees to *Epiphanius* to *Chrysostom* 399 p. 85, & 88. and *Hierom*; and from this last hand it is like *Anastasius* received them long after, because it was more than two years after this Synod, before *S. Hierom* could persuade *Anastasius* to condemn these Opinions of *Origen*, which this Council first censured: Wherefore it was happy for the Church, that there were wiser Men in it than he who is pretended to be the supreme and sole Judge of Heresie. And thus we have finished our Remarks upon the Councils in the first four Centuries, in all which the Reader (I hope) hath seen such designs to advance the Supremacy, and cover the Corruptions of *Rome*, that he will scarce credit any thing they say for their own Advantage in any of the succeeding Volumes.

---



A N  
 APPENDIX  
 CONCERNING  
 BARONIUS  
 H I S  
 ANNALS.

§1. **T**HE large and elaborate Volumes of Cardinal *Baronius*, are the main Guide to the Editors and Annotator: From him they take the Dates of all Councils, and out of him they have added divers new Synods not extant in the older Editions of the Councils, of which they can say no more, than to abbreviate *Baronius*: From him they borrow most of their plausible Notes, by which they either paint over that which seems for the Interest of *Rome*, or disparage what makes against it; and therefore we have had often occasion to discover his Fallacies in all that part of his Annals which concerns the Councils; but there are many other notorious

X

Frauds

Frauds and manifest Falshoods in that Author, of which I shall here give some few Instances, which may serve as a Caution to all that read his History, and also as a Direction by which they may in other Centuries find out his manifold Errours; and I shall confine the Examples here produced to the Fourth Century, because that is the most largely treated of in this Discourse.

It is evident, that all the Writers of the Roman side, for many Ages have designed to impose upon the World; in that, their Disputants, their Publishers of Councils, and Historians do all agree; for their Principles and Practices cannot be maintained by plain Truth. The Methods used by *Baronius*, in his Ecclesiastical Annals (which he writ purely to serve the Interest of the Roman Church) may be reduced to these Heads:

*First*, His frequent quoting Forged and Spurious Tracts; such as the *Pontifical*, the Acts of the Martyrs, the Ecclesiastical Tables (that is, the Roman *Missal* and *Martyrology*) with other late and fabulous Writers, such as *Nicephorus*, *Simeon*, *Metaphrastes*, *Laurentius Surius*, &c. And the Reader shall find, he very seldom cites any other Authors to prove the Great Actions of Primitive Popes, or the dignity of the Roman Church, and its pretended Privileges: As also to make out the Miracles done by many of their Saints, and to be evidence for the *Invocation of Saints*, *Praying for the Dead*, *Worshiping the Cross*, *Relicks and Images*; for the *Merits of Celibacy and Holiness of Monks*, or other Superstitions. Some Examples of which in the Fourth Century are these: He cites the Acts of *Procopius*, which he confesseth need amending, to prove the *Adoration of the Cross* (a); he proves the same by the Acts of *Gregory* an Armenian Bishop, which he owns do not satisfy many; and by *Euthymius*, a late Grecian Monk, *An. 1180* (b). Thus he asserts *Crispus* his being Baptized with his Father *Constantine*, only by *Nicephorus*, and makes out *Constantine's* use of putting an Image

(a) *Baron. An.*  
308 p. 30. §. 19.

(b) *Id. An. 311.*  
p. 57. §. 23.



Image of Christ on his Coyns, only by the Acts of *Damasus*, and by a Coyn which he himself confesseth had been adulterated (c). *Constantine's Baptism in Rome* is also proved by *Anastasius Bibliothecarius*, who there hath the false Character of an Acurate Writer (d), and by the Acts of *Sylvester*, which he himself disapproves of in many things (e); and suspects, that notwithstanding all these fabulous Authors, his Reader will not credit the Story (f). The Legend of *S. Agnes* and her Temple at *Rome*, he confesses, Was made by an Unknown-hand under the Name of *S. Ambrose*; yet he gives a long relation of it (g). So when *Eusebius*, who writ acurately about the Temple built over the Sepulchre by *Constantine*, saith nothing of Pictures in it, he proves there was such there by the second *Nicene Council* (h). *Eusebius's* Greek Chronicle saith nothing of the *Invention of the Cross*, but some Forger hath put it into the Latin Version of it; therefore *Baronius* cites the corrupted Latin Translation to prove this Legend (i). The Miracles of *S. Nicholas* are all transcribed out of his Acts, which were put together by Authors who lived above Five hundred years after his time, and the genuine ancient Historians mention not one of them (k). *Eusebius* saith, *Constantine* dedicated his new City of *Constantinople* to God; but *Baronius* chooses to follow a later Writer of little credit, viz. *Nicephorus*; who saith (in the Phrase of his own time) He dedicated it to the Virgin Mary (l). He makes a discourse about the use of the Pall in the Life of Pope *Mark*; yet he can cite no Author, but the fabulous Pontifical, to prove it was used in his time (m). To prove the *Arian Pope Felix* was a Martyr, he cites an Inscription pretended to be found in a Grave at *Rome* (where such Frauds are common) about Twelve hundred years after his Death (n); so he makes out the Martyrdom of divers under *Julian* by an Oration of *Nestarius* (which he confesses is corrupted) and by *Nicephorus* (o): And a little after he tells long Stories of Martyrs at that time condemned by *Julian* at *Rome*.

(c) Id. An. 324.  
pag. 233. §. 13.  
& 16.  
(d) Ibid. p. 237.  
§. 30.

(e) Ibid. §. 31.  
(f) Ibid. p. 238.  
§. 32.

(g) Ib. pag. 260.  
§. 107.

(h) Baron An.  
326. pag. 353.  
§. 42.

(i) Id. ibid.

(k) An. 326.  
p. 366. §. 86.

(l) Ibid. An. 330.  
p. 396. §. 4.

(m) An. 336.  
p. 458 §. 63.

(n) An. 357.  
pag. 715. §. 50.

(o) Annal.  
Tom. IV. An.  
362. p. 21, & 22.

- Rome*, which he proves by the Ecclesiastical Tables, and by the Acts of the Martyrs; yet he owns *Julian* was not at *Rome* at this time (p). Prayers at the Graves of the Saints he would establish by a forged Book of the Lives of the Prophets, which he cites under *Ephraim*'s name (q): So he would make out Prayers for the Dead, used in this Age, by feigned Writings, which are ascribed to *Ephraem Syrus* (r). The Miracles ascribed to *Damasus* cannot be proved by one Author of Credit, but are set off with the forged Acts of *Damasus*, and the modern Legends (s). So also the Miracles ascribed to *S. Chrysostom*, are not taken generally from any approved Authors, but from his spurious Acts (t); and (to name no more) thus he proves the Adoration of the Crois by an Homily falsely ascribed to *S. Chrysostom* (u): For his genuine Works do witness against this practice. And now that he did not cite these Authorities out of ignorance, is plain from his Confession; for he saith of the Acts of the Martyrs, *That we might better have wanted many Truths concerning them, than have had such a mixture of Errours as makes the whole suspected* (w). And again, speaking of the Acts of *Gallicanus*, *It is the manner of some to be ashamed, to give a short Narrative of a great Affair, and so according to their own Fancy they largely paraphrase on it*: (x): And yet again in his Preface to the Roman Martyrology he tells us, *There was a sad loss of these Martyrs Acts in Diocletian's time, so that very few of them are to be found, which may not in part be convicted of Mistakes* (s). But *Melch. Canus* is more ingenuous, and saith, *Diogenes Laertius writ the Lives of the Philosophers more honestly, than the Christians have writ those of the Saints* (t): Yet you rarely have any better Evidence than these, for most of the Roman Doctrines and Rites. And though *Nicephorus* and the Modern Greeks be frequently taxed by him, for giving ease faith to feigned Stories, and for gross Mistakes (u); yet when they tell never such improbable Tales for the Roman Interest, then they are cited with great applause: Now it is a clear evidence of an ill Cause, when
- (p) Eod. An. pag. 84.  
 (q) An. 373. pag. 309.  
 (r) An. 378. p. 332.  
 (s) An. 384. p. 427.  
 (t) An. 386. pag. 468.  
 (u) An. 397. Tom. V. p. 44.  
 (w) Baron. An. 307. §. 33. p. 24. Tom III.  
 (x) Id. An. 330. §. 51. p. 410.  
 (s) Bar. Præcap. ad Martyr. c. 3.  
 (t) Melch. Can. Can. loc. Theol. l. 11. p. 333.  
 (u) An. 306. §. 12. pag. 3. & Tom. IV. An. 363. p. 105.

when they can find no other Proofs but such spurious Writings as these; of which practice I have here given but a few Instances; but the diligent Reader will observe this to be customary with *Baronius*, not only in this fourth Century, but in every part of his *Annals*.

§.2. Another Artifice is to corrupt the Words or the Sense of genuine Authors, of which we will select also a few Instances, in the same Century. *S. Augustine* barely names *Peter* as one whom the Pagans did Calumniate (w); but *Baronius* brings this in with this (w) *Aug. de Civ. Dei*, lib. 18. c. 53. Preface, *That they did this, because they saw Peter extremely magnified, especially at Rome where he had fixed his Seat*; and then he saith, *S. Augustine records this, &c.* whereas this is his own Invention, to set off the glory of *Rome* (x). So when *Athanasius* is proving, that the (x) *Baron. An.* Fathers before the *Nicene Council* used the word 313. §. 17. *ὁ ἁγίος*, and first names *Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria*, and then *Dionysius Bishop of Rome* (y). *Baronius* saith, (y) *Athanas. de* He proves it especially by *Dionysius the holy Roman* decret. in *Arian.* Pope, and by *Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria* (z), in- (z) *Baron. An.* verting the Order, and putting a Note of Eminence 325. §. 69. on the Pope, contrary to the Words and Sense of *Athanasius*. Again, he cites Pope *Leo* (who is no Evidence in his own Cause); and yet *Baronius* would make him say more than he doth, even where he saith more than he should say: For he cites his 53<sup>d</sup> Epistle to shew, that *Leo* affirmed the sixth Canon of *Nice*, allowed to the Church of *Alexandria* the second, and to that of *Antioch* the third Seat, which had before been conferred on them by *Rome*. But the very words of *Leo*, cited by *Baronius*, shew this to be false; for *Leo* saith not, that these Sees had their Dignity or Order from *Rome*, but the former from *S. Mark*, the later from *Peter's* first Preaching there (a). Moreover, to (a) *Leon. ep. 53.* make his Reader fancy the Roman and the Catholic ap. *Baron. An.* Church was all one of old, he mentions out of *Epi-* 325. §. 28. *phanus*, *Constantine's* writing an Epistle to all *Romania*, Which

*How Leo Legated  
fell her the canon  
at the C<sup>o</sup> of Chalced.  
on the Epistle on the  
Letter B<sup>o</sup> C. A. H. 171*

(b) *Baron. An.*  
319. §. 6.

(c) *Epiphan.*  
*contra Manich.*  
hær. 66. 8c  
*contr. Arian.*  
hær. 69.

(d) *Opt. Milen.*  
*lib. 2. pag. 48.*  
*Baldwin. notis.*  
pag. 184.

(c) *Baron. An.*  
321. §. 5.

(f) *Opt. Milen.*  
*lib. 2. pag. 50.*

Which Name (saith he) we sometimes find used for the Catholic Church (b); whereas it is manifest, that Epiphanius both there and elsewhere plainly uses *Romania* for the Roman Empire (c); and Baronius did not find it used either in him, or in any other ancient Author, in any other sense. That Period in *Optatus*, which Baronius cites with great applause (if it be not added by some ignorant Zealot of the Roman side) is a scandal to the Learning of that Father, for he derives the Syriac word, *Cephas*, from the Greek *Κεφαλή*, and by that ridiculous Etymology would draw as contemptible a consequence, viz. *That Peter was Head of the Apostles*; and again he seems wilfully to pervert the Precept of S. Paul, Rom. XII. 13. *Distributing to the necessities of the Saints*; which in *Optatus's* Reading is, *Communicating with the Memories of the Saints*; that is, (as he applies it) *with Rome, where there are the Memorials of two of the Apostles*. I could wish for *Optatus's* Credit that these weak Passages were spurious, or buried in silence; and the Learned Baldwin is ashamed of this gross Error (d): But Baronius thinks, though they make for the dishonour of the Father, they tend to the Credit of Rome, and so he cites them in great pomp, and puts them in a whole Line to make them look more plausible, — *the Head of the Apostles, whence he was called Cephas* (so *Optatus*: But Binius adds) *deducing the Interpretation from the Greek Word, for in Syriac it signifies an hard Stone* (e); and then glories extremely, as if *Optatus* had made Communion with Rome the sole Note of a Catholic. Whereas in the next Page but one, *Optatus* goes on, — *You cannot prove you have any Communion with the Seven Churches of Asia, — and yet if you be out of the Communion of those Churches, you are to be accounted Aliens*. Which Passage Baronius very fraudulently leaves out (f), because it shews a true Catholic must not only be in Communion with Rome, but also with all other Orthodox Churches,

To proceed, Even in spurious Authors he useth this Artifice; for that Forged Book of *Constantine's* Munificence only saith, *He placed a piece of the Cross, in a Church which he had built: But Baronius relates it That he placed it there with most Religious Worship* (g); (g) *Baron. An. 324. §. 105.* and a little after he perceiving that Fabulous Author had supposed *Constantine* buried his Mother long before she died, puts in of his own head, *But this (i.e. the putting his Mother in a Porphyry Coffin) was done afterward* (h). Speaking of the Bishops returning home from the Council of Nice, he saith, *They took with them the Rule of Faith, confirmed by the Pope of Rome, to be communicated to their People, and to absent Bishops: But no Historian, Ancient or Authentic, mentions any preceding Confirmation of the Nicene Creed by the Pope, who was one of the absent Bishops, to whom it was to be communicated; wherefore those words, Of its being confirmed by the Pope, are invented and added to the story by Baronius* (i). He (i) *Baron. An. 325. §. 197.* observes, *That Constantine confesses, he was not fit to judge in the Case of Athanasius, because Ecclesiastical Matters were to be judged among the Clergy: Which he proves by Constantine's Letter there recited; but Constantine's Letter is not directed to the Clergy, but To the People of the Catholic Church at Alexandria: And his Words are to the People who lived on the Place, and knew the Matters of Fact; and therefore he saith to them, It is proper for you, and not for me to judge of that Affair* (k); so that *Baronius* forceth his (k) *Baron. An. 329. §. 7, 8.* own Sense upon the Emperour. And when *Theodoret* speaketh of ——— time for Repentance according to the Canons of the Church, he adds, ——— that is, for Satisfaction. Which Popish Satisfaction he would also prove out of a Canon at *Antioch*, which only mentions confessing the Fault, and bringing forth fruits meet for Repentance (l). When *Socrates* only saith, (l) *An. 341. Eusebius of Nicomedia's Letters were received by Julius §. 43; & 44.* after his death; *Baronius* thus enlarges it, *Eusebius, who had fled from the Judgment of the Roman Church was forced*

- (m) Vid. Socrat. lib. 2. cap. 13. Baron. An. 342. §. 43. forced against his Will, being dead (as Socrates saith) to come to the strict Tribunal of God (m). Where Athanasius saith, I went up to Rome, that I might visit the Church and the Bishop: Baronius ridiculously infers, that when we find the Ancients speaking of *THE Church* and *THE Bishop*, they mean the Roman Church and that Bishop, of whom, and in whom, and by whom are all other Bishops (n). Which Note is forced upon this place, for here Rome is named in the same Sentence with the Church and the Bishop, and so it must be understood of the Pope; but without any advantage to him more than it would have been to the Bishop of Eugubium, to say, I went to Eugubium and visited the Church and the Bishop. Again, S. Hierom saith expressly, that Acacius substituted Felix an Arian to be Bishop of Rome in Liberius his stead. Here Baronius pretends some Copies leave out the word Arian, and so he reads it, Substituted Felix to be Bishop of Rome (o); and because some such Parasites of Rome as himself, who would not endure that ingrateful Truth of a Pope's being an Heretic, had left out this word, He boldly asserts it for the true Reading; whereas not only Socrates expressly saith, He was an Arian in Opinion; but Hierom himself in his Chronicle affirms, that Felix was put in by the Arians; and it is not like they would have put him in, if he had not been of their party. The Greek of Sozomen is no more but Τὸν Πέτρον δεῖρον μὴ ἀδελφεῖν. but Baronius improves this by a flattering Paraphrase in these words, *Lest the Seat of Peter should be bespattered with any spot of Infamy* (p). But it is a bolder falsification of S. Chrysostom, where he saith (in one of his Sermons, on a day celebrated in memory of two Martyrs, Juvenius and Maximus) — οἰσεσθὲν ἡμᾶς ὁμωμάρτυς Μάρτυρες; to pervert this by his Latin Version thus, *The Martyrs which we this day worship*; whereas Chrysostom only saith, *The Martyrs which occasion us to meet this day* (q). Epiphanius expressly condemns those as Heretics who worship the Blessed Virgin, and saith,
- No

(q) Chrysost.  
Tom. V. p. 534.  
Baron. An. 362.  
pag. 48.



No man may adore Mary. *Baronius* will not cite this place at large, but adds to it these Words, — *she is not to be worshipped as a God*: Which Falsification of the Father is designed to excuse their Churches Idolatrous worship of the Virgin *Mary* (r). The restitution of (r) *Epiphanius* Peter Bishop of *Alexandria* is by *S. Hierom* (whom he cites with applause) ascribed to the late Repentance of the Emperour *Valens*: who recalled (now at last) the Orthodox from Banishment; and *Socrates* only mentions *Damasus's* Letters, which *Peter* took with him, approving both his Creation and the *Nicene* Faith: Yet he from hence notes the Supreme Power of the Pope, by whose order the Bishop of *Alexandria* was restored to his Church, in contempt of *Valens's* Authority; and when he returned with the Popes Authority, the People placed him in his Seat (s). Yea, after this he pretends to cite *Socrates*, as if he said, *Peter* was received, being restored by *Damasus* (t); yet *Damasus* did no more in all this matter, than barely to testify that *Peter* was an Orthodox Bishop, and that he believed him duly elected; which is all that *Socrates* saith, and which if any eminent Orthodox Bishops had testified, it would equally have served the Bishop of *Alexandria's* Cause. To conclude, *Baronius* owns *Paulinus*, to have been a credulous Man, and very unskilful in Ecclesiastical History (u); yet thinking he had not spoken enough, when he relates, *That a Church was adorned with Pictures*; he stretches this into, *Adorned with Sacred Images* (w). From all which Instances we may infer, That the Cardinal would not stick at misquoting and misrepresenting his Authors, when it might serve the Roman Interest.

(r) *Epiphanius* *hæres.* 79. *Baronius* An. 373. p. 309.

(s) *Socrates* lib. 4. cap. 30. 8c *Baronius* An. 377. pag. 325. (t) *Id.* An. 378. pag. 335.

(u) *Baronius* Tom. V. An. 395. p. 15.

(w) *Id.* An. 394. pag. 612.

§. 3. Of this kind also we may reckon his crafty suppressing such Authorities, in whole or in part, as seem to cross the Opinions and Practices of their Church. His leaving out a passage in *Optatus*, wherein that Father makes the being in Communion with the Seven Churches of *Asia* a Note of a true Catholic,

Y

was

(x) Vid. supra  
§. 2. & Baron.  
An. 321. §. 5.

(y) Sozom.  
lib. 7. cap. 4.  
p. 415.

(z) Baron. An.  
378. pag. 339.

(a) Baron. An.  
378. pag. 347.

b) Hieron. Ep. 13.  
Tom. I. p. 120.  
Baron. An. 386.  
p. 454, 455.

(c) Baron. An.  
394. p. 613.

was noted before (x). And we may give many such like Instances: *Sozomen* relates an Imperial Law, wherein those are declared Heretics, who do not hold the Faith, which *Damasus Bishop of Rome* and *Peter of Alexandria* then held (y); but the fraudulent Annalist leaves out *Peter of Alexandria*, and mentions only *Damasus* as the sole standard of Catholic Faith (z). When *S. Hierom* saith; His Adversaries condemned him with *Damasus* and *Peter*: *Baronius* bids us observe, with what reverence the Pope's Enemies treated him; for though they accused *S. Hierom* of Heresie, yet against *Damasus* they durst not open their Mouth (a); whereas *S. Hierom* protected himself by the Authority of the Bishop of *Alexandria*, as well as by that of the Pope. Again, after a crafty Device to hide the evident Testimony which *Gregory Nyssen* gives, against going in Pilgrimage to *Jerusalem*, He slightly mentions an Epistle of *S. Hierom*, which excellently confutes that then growing Superstition; telling us, That the Court of Heaven is as open from Britain as from Jerusalem. Which remarkable Sentence, and all the other learned Arguments of that Epistle he omits by design (b); though if it had countenanced this Superstition, we should have had it cited at large. In like manner afterwards, when he had another fair occasion to cite this same Epistle, which doth so effectually condemn Pilgrimages, he will not quote one word out of it, but barely mentions it, and runs out into the Enquiry, what time it was writ (c). I have given many more Instances of these fraudulent Concealments in my Discourse of Councils, and therefore shall add no more here, but only this, That whoever reads *Baronius's Annals*, hears no more generally than the Evidence of one side; and that too, enlarged, if it be never so slight, and commended, if it be never so spurious; but whatever makes against the Roman Church is depreciated and perverted, or else clapt under Hatches, and kept out of sight: Of which we have an Instance in *Ensebius*, who because he will not justify their Forgeries

Forgeries about *Constantine's* Baptism and Donation, (though he be the best of all the Ecclesiastical Historians) is never cited, but with Reproaches and Calumnies (d); and whatever he saith against them, is either concealed, or the force of it taken off, by reviling him as an *Arian*.

(d) *Annal.* 324.  
§. 143, 144,  
& 152.  
*An.* 325. §. 192,  
& 193.

§. 4. Another Artifice of our *Annalist* is, first to suppose things which make for the honour of his Church, without any manner of proof, and then to take his own Suppositions for grounds of Argument. Thus he supposes, that *Constantine* gave *S. Peter* thanks for his Victory, without any evidence from History (e); (e) *Baron. An.* yea, against his own peculiar Notion, That *Constantine* was then a Pagan, and durst not do any act to make him seem a Christian (f). Again, To colour their Worship of Images, He barely supposes, that the Pagan Senate dedicated a Golden Image of Christ to *Constantine* (g): He argues only from Conjectures, to prove the Munificence of that Emperour to Rome (h); whereas, if so eminent a Prince had given such great Gifts to the most famous City in the World, doubtless some Author would have mentioned it, and not have left the Cardinal to prove this by random Guesses. Again, He supposes without any proof, that *Constantine* knew the Supreme Power over all Christians, was in the Church of Rome (i). He produces nothing but meer Conjectures, that *Osius* was the Pope's Legate; yet he boldly draws rare Inferences from this (k). He doth but guess and take it for granted, that the *Nicene* Council was called by the Advice of Pope *Sylvester* (l); yet this is a Foundation for the Supremacy, and I know not what. Thus, when he hath no Author to prove, that *Athanasius* venerated the Martyrs, he makes it out with Who can doubt it?—and it is fit to believe he did so (m). So he tells us, He had said before, that *Damasus* favoured *Gregory Nazianzen* in his being elected to be Bishop of *Constantinople* (n). He supposes this

*Et An.* 336.  
§. 7, 8. Item  
*An.* 340. §. 40,  
&c.

(f) *Id. ibid.* §. 62.  
(g) *Baron. An.* 312. §. 38.

(h) *Baron. An.* 312. §. 68, 69.

(i) *Id. ibid.* §. 72.

(j) *Eod. An.* §. 117.

(k) *Eod. An.* §. 127.

(l) *Eod. An.* §. ult.

(m) *Baron. An.* 342. §. 42.

(n) *Baron. An.* 340. pag. 362.

- (o) *Ibid.* p. 359. indeed a little before (o): But all Ancient Authors say, and he himself affirms, That Peter (Bishop of Alexandria) did institute him into that Bishopric (p). He only supposes Siricius desired Theodosius to banish the Manichees from Rome; but the Rescript is not directed to him, but to Albinus the Præfect; and (except the fabulous Pontifical) there is no Evidence that Siricius was concerned in this matter (q). Theodoret saith, The Emperour chose Telemachus into the number of Martyrs; but Baronius supposes, This was done not only by the Emperour's Care, but by the Ecclesiastical Authority of the Pope (r). To conclude, He affirms by guess, That S. Nicetus came out of Dacia into Italy, to Visit the Apostles Tombs, and to consult the Apostolical Seat (s); but no Author makes this out. Now, how can any Reader trust an Historian, who in relating things done many Ages ago, takes the liberty to invent and suppose whatever will serve a present Turn?

- §. 5. Add to this that he scruples not to contradict himself, and to tell manifest Untruths to carry on the Interest of Rome, which we shall prove by these Examples: He affirms Calicianus (Bishop of Carthage) relied upon one defence, The Communion of the Apostolic See; but immediately he tells us, That he was supported by Constantine's favour (t). He cites S. Augustine, saying, Constantine (when Cæcilian's Cause was referred to him) was a Christian Emperour; yea, he cites a Letter of Constantine, writ in a most Christian style; and yet he feigns, that Calicianus delayed his appearing before this Emperour, because he thought it unfit that a Bishop should be judged by a Lay-man, not yet Baptized (u). And again, Eight years after this he represents Constantine as a meer Pagan, who had never heard of Peter or Paul, and took them for some Heathen Deities (w); whereas he saith, He was a Catechumen, and out of the Gospel had imbibed the Christian Meekness eight years before (x). He
- (t) *Baron. An.* 313. §. 18, 19.  
 (u) *Baron. An.* 316. §. 59, & 62.  
 Collat. cum §. 66.  
 (w) *Baron. An.* 324. §. 39.  
 (x) *Id. An.* 316. §. 65.

He also affirms, That in the Year 324 there was as yet none of the Senators believed the Christian Faith (y). (y) Baron. An. 324. §. 76. And yet he saith, Two year before this, that one or both the Consuls were Christians (z); yea, in the year 312. He reckons up many Senators, who had given up their Names to Christ (a). Thus he contradicts himself by following those Lying Acts of *Sylvester*, in order to support the false Story of *Constantine's* being Baptized at Rome. Soon after, out of a Fabulous Author. he talks very big of the low Reverence which *Constantine* paid to the Bishops at the Nicene Council (b); whereas all the Authentic Historians say, The Bishops rose up when he entred in, and paid him a great respect (c). And when he hath told many incredible Legends about the Nails of the Cross, and seems to grant that divers false Nails have been adored for the true, he excuses his abused Catholics for their mistaken Worship of false Relics, saying, That their Faith excuses their Fault (d); so that Lies may be innocently told and believed (it seems) at Rome. Again he affirms, there were Monks at Rome in the year 328, and proves this by what *S. Augustine* saw there at least fifty years after (e); yea, in the year 340 he saith, *Athanasius* first brought the Institution of Monks to Rome (f), which is a manifest contradiction.

To proceed, I wonder with what Face he could commend *Athanasius* for speaking charitably of the Heretic *Arius*, after he was dead, when he reviles *Eusebius* after his death (g); And never mentions any of the Protestant Doctors deceased, but with the bitterest Malice, and in the most spiteful Language he can invent: If Charity were a Vertue in *Athanasius*, then Malice must be a Vice in him. He largely relates many Appeals to the Emperour in the case of *Athanasius*, and yet when at last the Bishop of Rome was chosen Arbitrator in this Case, and this but once, He cries out, Behold, Reader, the ancient Custom! &c. Whereas since the Emperours were Christi-

(y) Baron. An. 324. §. 76.

(z) Id. An. 322. §. 1.

(a) Id. An. 312. §. 75, & 76.

(b) Baron. An. 325. §. 16.

(c) Idem ibid. §. 52.

(d) Baron. An. 326. §. 51, — & 54.

(e) Baron. An. 328. §. 20, & 21.

(f) Id. An. 340. §. 8.

(g) Baron. An. 336. §. 44. Collat. cum An. 340. §. 38.

- (h) *Baron. An.* 340. §. 2. Christians, it was the Custom to appeal first to him, as his History abundantly proves (b). He very largely commends the Acts of Martyrs, but by following them falls into many Absurdities; as where he tells us, *That the Pagan Temple of Daphne at Antioch was burnt two days after the Martyrdom of Artemius (i):* Yet a little after he brings in this *Artemius* arguing with *Julian*, about the burning of this Temple (k). So he tells us, The Body of *S. John Baptist* was burnt to Ashes, except some Bones which were carried into *Egypt* to *Athanasius*: And yet a little after *S. Hierom* affirms, his Bones remained at *Sebaste*, and wrought Miracles there (l). As little Truth is there in his accusing *Maximus* the Emperour for presuming to judge of *Bishops Causes* (m); whereas *Maximus* his Letter to *Siricius* (which *Baronius* records (n)) declares, *He would call the Bishops to a Council in what City they pleased, and refer it to them (who were best skilled) to determine these matters.* Again, in order to justify those feigned Relicks of *Protasius* and *Gervasius* shewed now at *Rome*, he affirms, *That S. Ambrose gave part of them to several Bishops, and some of them were brought to Rome: Whereas S. Ambrose himself (who knew best what was done) assures us, He buried the Bodies whole, putting every Joynt in his own order (o).* And to name no more, *He brags, that Idols were pulled down no where with more zeal, than at Rome (p).*
- (i) *Baron. An.* 362. pag. 37. Yet a little after he brings in this *Artemius* arguing with *Julian*, about the burning of this Temple (k). So he tells us, The Body of *S. John Baptist* was burnt to Ashes, except some Bones which were carried into *Egypt* to *Athanasius*: And yet a little after *S. Hierom* affirms, his Bones remained at *Sebaste*, and wrought Miracles there (l). As little Truth is there in his accusing *Maximus* the Emperour for presuming to judge of *Bishops Causes* (m); whereas *Maximus* his Letter to *Siricius* (which *Baronius* records (n)) declares, *He would call the Bishops to a Council in what City they pleased, and refer it to them (who were best skilled) to determine these matters.* Again, in order to justify those feigned Relicks of *Protasius* and *Gervasius* shewed now at *Rome*, he affirms, *That S. Ambrose gave part of them to several Bishops, and some of them were brought to Rome: Whereas S. Ambrose himself (who knew best what was done) assures us, He buried the Bodies whole, putting every Joynt in his own order (o).* And to name no more, *He brags, that Idols were pulled down no where with more zeal, than at Rome (p).*
- (k) *Id. p.* 44.
- (l) *Baron. An.* 362. pag. 56.
- (m) *Baron. An.* 385. pag. 441.
- (n) *Id. An.* 387. pag. 474.
- (o) *Baron. An.* 387. pag. 468. Collat. cum *Ambrose Ep.* 85.
- (p) *Baron. An.* 389, & 390. pag. 526.
- Yet in the same Page he tells us, There was then newly dedicated an Altar there for sacrificing to the Heathen Gods: So that we see, designed Falshoods are not scrupled by him in things which seem to make for the honour of *Rome*, or her Opinions.



§. 6. We may also observe, that for the same ends He makes innumerable false Inferences on purpose to pervert the Truth; thus from S. *Augustine's* calling *Melchizedek*, *A Father of Christian People*, (as every Bishop is) *Baronius* concludes, that S. *Augustine* was for the Popes Supremacy (q): So from Bishops judging in Causes (q) *Baron. An.* where the People referred their Differences to them, *313. §. 29.* he frequently infers, *A right in Bishops, to judge in Temporal Matters* (r): In like manner from *Theodore's*, (r) *Baron. An.* mentioning a Canon of the Church in general, and *319. §. 30.* (as his discourse shews) referring to the Canon, which item *An. 326.* forbids any Bishop to judge a Cause till both parties §. 100. &c. were present, *Baronius* gathers, that the Pope was item *An. 398,* supreme over the Bishop of *Alexandria*, and that by pag. 61 & 62. the Canons of *Nice* (s). Again, That the Pope was (s) *Baron. An.* not beholding to the Council of *Nice* for his Supremacy, which he had from Christ, he proves by Pope *Nicholas* his Testimony, who had the impudence in his own Cause and for his own Ends, to tell this Story *Five hundred years after* (t): So he condemns the (t) *Id. ib. §. 130.* *Arians*, for ejecting Bishops without staying for the Bishop of *Rome's* Sentence, which he proves was unjust by an Epistle of Pope *Julius*, which says, *The Arians should first have writ to all Bishops, that so what was right might be determined by all* (u); where (u) *Baron. An.* *Julius* arrogates nothing to himself alone, as *Baronius* 336. §. 34. falsely pretends. And to make this single Privilege of *Rome* the more credible, he doth frequently apply what the Ancients say of all the Bishops of the West, to the Pope: Thus what S. *Basil* saith of all the Western Churches, he applies only to *Rome* (w): And when (w) *Baron. An.* he recites two Epistles of S. *Basil*, whose Title is to 371. pag. 239. the Western Bishops, and the whole discourse in it directed to many Bishops, he feigns the Name of the Pope is left out or lost, and concludes these Letters (x) *Baron. An.* were peculiarly directed to him, and this only to 371. pag. 238, support the *Roman* Supremacy (x); and therefore he &c. *An. 372.* repeats over and over this matter, and affirms, it was pag. 269, 270, 271, &c.

an

(y) Ibid. 273,  
274.

(z) Baron. An.  
375. pag. 320.

(a) Baron. An.  
372. pag. 276.  
& An. 373.  
pag. 310.

(b) Baron. An.  
372. pag. 285.

(c) Baron. An.  
382. pag. 402.

\* Baron. An.  
350. pag. 540.  
(d) Idem An.  
385. pag. 435.

an Embassy sent to the Pope (y). Thus also when S. Ambrose saith, *The Western Bishops by their Judgment approved of his Ordination*: He infers that S. Ambrose implies, *It was confirmed by a public Decree of the Apostolical See* (z). And whereas Basil speaking of those Western Bishops in his time, who (he saith) kept the Faith entirely; Baronius infers from hence, That their Successors, and especially the Bishops of Rome, have never erred since (a). Like to which is his inferring the usage of *Praying to Saints* from a pure Rhetorical flourish of Nazianzen's, in one of his Orations (b). And thus when S. Hierom uses all his Oratory to set off Virginity, because that seems to make for the Roman Celibacy, he takes him to be in good earnest, and will have all his Reflexions upon Marriage to be solid Arguments (c), though S. Hierom himself calls them Trifles\*. But when he tells a sober Truth about the Ignorance of the Roman Clergy, then the Cardinal tells us, *He speaks by way of Hyperbole* (d). From which Instances it doth appear, that our Annalist did not, like an Historian, endeavour to declare Truth, but only to serve an Interest and a Party.

§. 7. Lastly, His Partiality notoriously appears wherever the Church of Rome is any way concerned; for when any thing of this kind comes in his way, he puts off the Character of an Historian and turns Disputant, labouring to confute the most ancient and authentic Authors, if they seem to say any thing against that Church. Thus we may observe what tedious digressions he makes about the Primacy of Rome in his discourse on the Nicene Council, for which he twice makes Apologies (e). Again, he runs out into a long and very impertinent dispute about the *Worship of Images*, in an Age when no good Author mentions them as used in the Church (f). In like manner, He makes a long excursion to disprove an Authentic Story of Epiphanius, tearing a Veil with

(e) Baron. An.  
325. §. 136, &  
140.

(f) Baron. An.  
362. pag. 18.

a Picture wrought in it, because such things were not fit to be in Churches (g); and he scarce ever meets (g) *Baron. An.* 392.p.568. with any of the Roman Corruptions, mentioned in the most fabulous Authors, but he leaves the History, and enlarges into Remarks upon those Passages. But if the Writer be never so eminent, that touches any of these Sores, his business always is, to baffle the Evidence; of which there is scarce one year in his Annals, wherein there are not some Examples. On the other side, He takes every slight occasion to make the most spiteful Reflexions on all that he counts Enemies to the Roman Church: Thus he applies the Bishop of *Alexandria's* description of the *Arians* to the Reformed Churches, though it agree much better with these of his own Religion (b). Again, He reviles us, (h) *Baron. An.* 318.§.80. because we do not honour the Modern idle lewd Monks of their Communion, as much as the Ancients did those holy and devout Monks, which were in the Primitive Times, though it be plain to all the World, these are like them in nothing but the Name (i). The like Outcry he makes (i) *Baron. An.* 340.§.10. upon Protestants, for undeceiving some of those silly item *An.* 363. Nuns, who have been decoyed into unlawful Vows, p.132. meerly for Interest and Secular Ends; and affirms the perswading these to Marry, is worse than the *Arian's* ravishing and murdering them at *Alexandria* (k). (k) *Baron. An.* 326.§.29. Thus also he compares the Reformed Divines to the *Eunomians*, who taught, *Their Faith alone would save them, though their Lives were never so wicked* (l); forgetting that their Priest's convert (as they call it) (l) *Baron. An.* 360.§.38. Murderers at the Gallows, by teaching them this very Principle. And, to name no more Examples, when *S. Basil* inveighs against those who despised the Ancient Customs of the Primitive Church, He spitefully applies this to the Reformed (m). Whereas in very (m) *Baron. An.* 363.pag.131. Truth, they of *Rome* have left off more Ancient Rites, and brought in more new ones, than any sort of Christians in the World. By these and many more Instances which might be given, even out of this one

one Century, it is evident, that the whole design of his History is to make all the Doctrins and Practices of *Rome* seem to be Primitive and right, and that he cares not how unlawful the Means be which he uses, to gain this belief in his Reader.

§. Yet to conclude, we will observe, That after all his evil-Methods there are many things which he could neither avoid relating, nor yet excuse, which condemn the Modern Roman Church. I wonder how he could Commend *Constantine* for abolishing the Stews, and the prostituting of Christian Women there; and not observe, That the Pope now tolerates these Abominations in *Rome* it self (n). Again, how doth it agree with the INFALLIBILITY of the Pope, to say, *That one Holy Spirit governs the Catholic Church, so as to make the Bishops of all Ages and Places agree in the same Opinion* (o)? If this be so, what need one Bishop alone be made Infallible? And if it be (as he saith) a Doctrine taught by the Apostles, and consequently true, *That the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father*; then the Pope, who condemns this as an Heresie of the Greeks, is not Infallible (p). If *Constantine* had known of this Infallibility lodged at *Rome*, he would have sent thither for exact Copies of the Holy Scriptures, and not to *Eusebius* in *Palestina* (q). If *Damasus* had this Infallible Spirit, how came he (after he was Pope) to need to be instructed in the meaning of Scripture by *S. Hierom* (r)? Or, if his Successor *Siricius* had been Infallible, how could the *Origenists* (who held such palpable Heresies, that a Woman discovered them to be in an Error) impose upon his Simplicity; and get Letters Testimonial from this sole Judge of Heresie (s)? How came the Council of *Alexandria* to send their Decrees to *Epiphanius*, *S. Hierom* and *S. Chrysostom*, and not first send them to *Anastasius*, who was Infallible? And indeed *Baronius* cannot prove they were sent to him at all, but by saying, *It is fit to believe, they were sent* (t).

Moreover,

(n) *Baron. An.*  
314 §. 74.

(o) *Id. lb.* §. 76.

(p) *Baron. An.*  
325 §. 70.

(q) *Baron. An.*  
330 §. 23.

(r) *Baron. An.*  
379 pag. 353.

(s) *Baron. An.*  
397 pag. 32.

(t) *Baron. An.*  
399 p. 85. cum  
88.

Moreover, many things in this Century related by these Annals, look not favourably upon the SUPREMACY. *Constantine* calls *Eusebius's* Election to the See of *Antioch*, *An advancement to the Bishopric of the Universal Church* (u), which looks as if he knew nothing of the Pope's Pretences: That *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, even when he was accused before Pope *Julius*, should call him his *Fellow-Minister*, would have been very Sawcy, if he had known *Julius* to be the Supreme Bishop of the World (w). And if this Supremacy had been owned in former Ages, how came the Eastern Bishops to be so angry at their being desired to come to *Rome* (x); yea, how came they to Excommunicate the Pope, for communicating with one whom they had judged a Criminal (y)? It is not concerning the Pope, but *Athanasius*, that *Nazianzen* saith, *He did again prescribe Laws to the whole World* (z): It seems the Pope was not the Supreme Caller of Synods, when *S. Hierom* (speaking of a Council which he thought was not Authentic) Asks, *What Emperour ordered it to be Convened* (a). We cannot find in any genuine Antiquity in this Age, so great an Encomium of *Rome*, as *Nazianzen* the Elder gives of *Cæsarea*, viz. *That from the beginning it was, and now is accounted the Mother of almost all Churches, on which all the Christian World casts its Eye, like a Circle drawn from a Center* (b). A man would guess the Pope's Authority reached no further than the Suburbicarian Regions, because *Ursicinus* (*Damasus* his Competitor) was forbid by the Emperour from entering into *Rome*, or the Suburbicarian Regions (c). *S. Basil* was very unmannerly, if not unjust (had this Supremacy been then claimed) to send his first Embassy unto *Athanasius*, and tell him, that *He had the Care of all the Churches* (d); yea afterward, when he did send into the West, he directs his Epistle to the *Italian* and *Gallican* Bishops, without mentioning the Pope in particular: And truly *Damasus* (if he were Supreme)

(u) Baron. An. 324. §. 152.

(w) Baron. An. 341. §. 51.

(x) Baron. An. 341. §. 56, & 57.  
(y) Id. An. 347. §. 64.

(z) Baron. An. 362. pag. 66.

(a) Eod. An. pag. 80.

(b) Baron. An. 369. pag. 194.

(c) Baron. An. 371. pag. 235.

(d) Baron. An. eod. p. 236, 237. &c.

- took little care of his Office, since upon so pressing Occasions he would neither Answer *S. Basil*, nor *S. Hierom* for a long time. And *S. Hierom* was somewhat bold *when he reproves the Ambition of Rome*, and laid, *He would Follow no Chief but Christ* (e). *S. Ambrose* also seems not to give that deference to the Mother of all Churches that he ought, since he often Dined and made Feasts on the *Saturday*, which was a Fast at *Rome* (f); and had the Pope then been Supreme, why did *Ambrose* make a Bishop at *Sirmium*, in *Illyria*, so far from his own City of *Milan* (g)? The same *S. Ambrose* also speaks of *Supreme Bishops* in *Gallia* (h). It is strange that *Siricius*, the Supreme Pastor should let the Pagans set up an Altar to the Goddess of *Victory* in the Roman Capitol, and that *S. Ambrose* should be the only Complainant in this Case (i). Finally, if the Pope then had any Jurisdiction over the Eastern Churches, why was not he consulted about Ordaining *S. Chrysostom* Bishop of *Constantinople*? and how came the Patriarch of *Alexandria* to be sent to, and to Ordain him (k)? These Instances shew, the Supremacy of *Rome* was unknown in that Age: And so was the INVOCATION of SAINTS and ADORING of RELICKS also, as one might suspect by these Passages, That the Holy Men of those Ages, in their Dangers and Necessities are said only to have prayed to God, not to the Blessed Virgin, or to Saints and Angels for help: So did *Alexander* Bishop of *Constantinople* against *Arius* (l); so did *Parthenius* against the Pagans (m); so did *Constantius* the Emperour, for Recovery of his Health (n); so also did those *Persian* Martyrs (o). Thus *Euphrates*, an Eminent Bishop, implores only the help of Christ against an illusion of the Devil (p). The Christians who translated the Bones of *Babylas* the Martyr, did not Pray to him, but Praised God (q); and *Macedonius*, an holy Monk, is observed only to call upon God Night and Day (r). *Arcadius* the Empe-
- (e) *Bar. An.* 372. pag. 281, 282.
- (f) *Baron. An.* 375. pag. 321.
- (g) *Idem An.* 380. pag. 362.
- (h) *Baron. An.* 392. p. 53.
- (i) *Id. eod. An.* pag. 560.
- (k) *Baron. An.* 397. pag. 44.
- (l) *Baron. An.* 336. §. 47.
- (m) *An.* 337. §. 41.
- (n) *An.* 338. §. 11.
- (o) *An.* 343. §. 16.
- (p) *An.* 348. §. 9.
- (q) *An.* 362. pag. 40.
- (r) *An.* 388. pag. 477.



Emperour in an Earthquake prayed to the Lord, the only preserver of the Humble (s). *Porphyrius*, Bishop of *Gaza*, and his People, called only upon Christ, not upon any Saints (t): So that all these used the Protestant way of Worship. And the Romanists must be very unsafe in their Worship of Saints, since *Baronius* confesses, one of their Catalogues of Saints puts in the Names of two Hereticks, as good Catholic Saints (u). So also as to the Adoration of Relicks, the Faithful in *Persia* did not keep the Body of their Martyr to Worship, but buried it in a Tomb (v). So *S. Anthony* the Primitive Hermit, fearing and disliking this Superstition, ordered his Body to be put into a private and unknown Grave, according to the Custom of the Catholic Church (x); and therefore *Metaphrastes* his sole Evidence will not pass, for the Legend of translating the Bodies of *S. Andrew* and *S. Luke* to *Constantinople* (y). 'Tis true, this Superstition was then creeping in, and some Cheaters did begin to sell the Bones of False Martyrs (a Trade used at *Rome* for many Ages); but *Theodosius* his Law severely punished this Crime (z): Which ridiculous Imposture, *Julian* the witty Apostate had justly exposed some years before, as being contrary to Scripture and to the Christian Law (a).

(s) An. 396.  
pag. 21.  
(t) An. 398.  
pag. 71.

(u) Baron. An.  
340. §. 41. &c.  
An. 341. §. 11.  
(v) An. 343.  
§. 16.

(x) Baron. An.  
358. §. 23.

(y) Ibid. §. 25.

(z) Baron. An.  
386. pag. 455.

(a) Id. An. 362.  
pag. 92. &c.  
An. 361. p. 36.

To proceed, Had the Altars been then used to be adorned with IMAGES, as they are now at *Rome*, the Faithful would not have been so surprized at bringing in an Image, and placing it on the Altar, as *Optatus* saith they were (b); and *Baronius* can find no Precedent for carrying Images in Procession to procure Rain, but the Pagan Superstition (c). In *S. Ambroses* time the Virgins Apartment in the Church was not adorned with Pictures or Images, but (after the Protestant way) with Sentences of Holy Scripture (d). *Theodosius* should have excepted the Images of the Saints, when he forbad the honouring any Images void of Sense, with lighting Tapers, offering Incense and

(b) Baron. An.  
348. §. 33.

(c) Baron. An.  
362. pag. 60.

(d) Baron. An.  
377. pag. 327.

- (e) *Baron. An.* 392. pag. 562. and Garlands to them (e) : So that doubtless this is an INNOVATION in their Church, and so are many other of their Rites. The Pope's Bull, to choose a Stranger to be Bishop of a Church, whereof he never had been a Member, was unknown when Pope *Julius* condemned this Practice (f). The Custom of putting the *Wafer* in the Communicant's Mouth (as *Baronius* confelleth) was unknown in this Century, when (Protestant like) they took it into their hands (g). In *S. Augustine's* time the People at *Rome* Fasted on *Wednesdays* which use they have now left off (h). When the Rites of Burial used at Christian Funerals are described by *Nazianzen* (on occasion of the Funeral of *Cæsarius*) there is no mention of any Prayers for his Soul; for that Superstition was not then allowed (i). The carrying a Cross before them in Procession, cannot be made out in this Age, but by the spurious Acts of Martyrs cited by *Metaphrastes* (k). But lest I tire the Reader, I will conclude with one or two Instances more, to shew the difference between Modern *Rome* and this Age: Their Monks now are not like those of that time, but resemble the *Messalian* Heretics, who pretended to *Pray continually*, and never used any labour; and claimed all mens *Alms* as due only to them; who said, that *Marriages might be dissolved*, seducing Children from their Parents, and boasting they were pure from Sin; yea, wearing *Sackcloth*, that all may see it (l). *Theodosius* made a Law to banish Monks from Cities, and oblige them to retire into Desert places (m): But the Modern Monks are all for Noble Seats in the best frequented Cities; so that these and those are vastly different. Finally, He makes the Persecuting Spirit of *Macedonius*, and the Patience of *Athanasius*, a mark to distinguish Truth from Heresie: Now, if we apply this Mark; as none are greater Persecutors than the Romanists, so we must conclude none are further from the Truth (n).
- (f) *Baron. An.* 341. §. 17.
- (g) *Baron. An.* 361. p. 2.
- (h) *Baron. An.* 388. pag. 495.
- (i) *Baron. An.* 368. pag. 179.
- (k) *Baron. An.* 398. p. 71.
- (l) *Baron. An.* 361. §. 35, ad §. 39.
- (m) *Baron. An.* 390. pag. 537.
- (n) *Baron. An.* 360. §. 27, & 28.

And

And now by these few Instances, within the compass of one Century, the Reader may judge what Truth there can be in that Religion, that needs so many Frauds to hide its Faults; and what trust can be given to that Historian, who to serve an ill Cause, makes no scruple to use all these kinds of Deceit. This may warn all that design to peruse these *Annals*, not to rely upon any of his Authorities or Arguments without examining, and also not to take every thing for Primitive and Ancient, which he pretends to be so. This may suffice for this Volume, and (if we proceed) we shall make the like Remarks on the following Tomes; to shew, that their Religion is made up of Falshoods, and cannot be defended without Lying and Forgery, which is the great support of their Evil Cause.

F I N I S.

*Glory be to the GOD of Truth.*